

POOR DOCUMENT

THE WEEKLY HERALD

CHARLES H. LOREN, EDITOR AND PROPRIETOR.
FREDERICTON, N. B., JULY 20, 1882.

DRAWING THE LINES.

The Farmer wants to draw the lines in local politics as they are drawn in Dominion issues. It proceeds to define the difference between the Tories and the Liberals in this fashion:

The Liberal Conservatives go for maintaining the constitution of the Confederation, and preserving connection with the Mother Country, and keeping up the N. P., or a modified system of protection to native industries. The Liberals on the contrary, go in for changes and innovations on the constitution, for abolishing the Senate, or making it elective; they would strain the bond that binds Canada to the Mother Country by snapping, by demanding the power of treaty making, which would be gained, be a long step towards complete independence, and by working for complete freedom of trade, and a commercial union with the United States, which would be a long step, again, to annexation.

Certain naturalists went to Cuvier for a definition of a crab. It was as follows: "A crab is a small red fish, which walks backwards." "Gentlemen," said Cuvier, "the crab is not a fish; it is not red; it does not walk backwards. With these exceptions your definition is correct." A similar observation might be made in reference to the Farmer's definition. The Liberal Conservatives do not "go for laboring to bring about the centralization of power at Ottawa; and the Premier does not hesitate to declare himself favorable to a legislative union. The maintenance of a connection with the Mother Country is not a question in Canadian politics. A few public men have advocated independence, the most prominent among them being Sir Alex. Gait, Tory Commissioner to Great Britain. "A modified system of protection" is not a plank in the Tory platform. This is the essence of the Liberal view of the tariff. On the other hand the Liberals have not declared themselves in favor of abolishing the Senate or making it elective, they are not endeavoring to snap connection with the Mother Country, they are not working for freedom of trade, unless by this the Farmer means freedom from monopolists, because they have declared free trade to be an impossibility in Canada, and they are not seeking to bring about a commercial union with the United States. With these exceptions the Farmer's definition is entirely accurate. After some remarks about the reasons why all Tories would seek to keep up the Legislative Council, in the course of which it shows its inability to distinguish between real dignity and sham ceremonial, the Farmer with marvellous wisdom, remarks, that if his ideas were adopted "the abolishing of the Legislative Council would not be a mere question of reducing the expenditure, but would mean that those who opposed it were those who urged it were on the side of or against conserving the constitution, maintaining connection with the Mother Country, and against, or for independence."

What utter nonsense this is. What earthly connection is there between the Legislative Council and the independence of Canada? But trying out our local politicians by this test we arrive at some strange results. When the question of the abolition of the Council was before the Legislature the gentlemen who were most prominent in favor of its retention were Messrs. Elder and Lynot, neither of whom were prepared at that time to support a measure looking to its abolition. Yet both of these gentlemen are Liberals. Indeed the Farmer cannot point out a Tory, or if it likes the term better, a Liberal Conservative, in the Legislature, who declared himself in favor of retaining the Council. The following Liberal-Conservative voted for its abolition: Messrs. Fraser, Wedderburn, Marshall, Hanington, Landry, Perley, Willis, White, Woods, Butler, Adams, Turner and Dr. Lewis. If the Farmer's logic is good these gentlemen are in favor of independence, free trade and commercial treaties with the United States, and in short are Liberals; but they are not Liberals, therefore there must be some error in the Farmer's test. Surely this one instance must show our contemporary what an inextricable muddle things would get into if his ideas were acted upon. The proper division to make in the local Legislature is one upon subjects over which the Legislature has jurisdiction.

A GREAT deal is said about the prevalence of crime in Ireland. It ought not to be forgotten by those who are fond of referring to the criminal statistics of that country, that if the offences committed even in the most favored lands were as carefully tabulated as those in Ireland are the record would furnish a vast field for moralizing. To be sure five murders a month is five too many; but we would not think that New Brunswick had become entirely given-up to crime because four men were killed in the Province in a year, and yet the number in proportion to the population would be about the same as that which has excited such denunciations in the case of Ireland.

The death of Habblo Knight Brown, one of *l'arch*'s artists, is announced.

THE UNIVERSITY.

The late Enochian exercises at the University have attracted public attention to that institution, and while the remembrance of the festivities is fresh it is not inopportune to urge upon the people of the Province generally the importance of this our chief educational institution. Whether it is considered in respect to the learning of its Professors, the extent of its scientific appliances, or the number and importance of the subjects embraced in the course of study, the University occupies a high position. A degree of Bachelor of Arts conferred by it represents a great deal of mental training and acquired knowledge. During the last academical year more students were in attendance than in any previous year, and this would appear to indicate that its popularity is on the increase. The number of students last year was fifty-three, and although this may seem small in comparison with the long lists of students at the great Universities of the United States, of Ontario and Quebec, it must not be forgotten that there are no special causes of medicine, law or theology at the New Brunswick institution as there are at the others. The proportion, which the students in the full arts course bear to the population of the Province, is probably fully as great as in any other instance which can be cited. It is worth while mentioning this, because we every now and then hear complaints that the good accomplished by the University does not compensate for the expenditure.

While we are upon this subject it may be as well to refer to the question of expense. This, including board, text books and all fees, may be put at \$175.00 a year for a student residing in the college, or it may not exceed \$150.00 for one residing in town. Under certain circumstances the tuition fees of \$22.50 per annum will be omitted. The University is authorized by law to award eighteen scholarships, one for each County in the Province and one for each class in the University. The scholarships are \$50 a year, and those for a county, if taken by a student matriculating for a full course, may be held for two years. The following county scholarships are now vacant—Albert, Carleton, Gloucester, Kent, Kings, Northumberland, Sunbury, Charlotte and Victoria. The holder of a County scholarship does not have to pay tuition fees and therefore the expense of attending the University to a student holding a County scholarship will be from \$70 to \$90.00 a year.

Very many of the graduates of the New Brunswick University have been brought into competition with those who have taken similar courses elsewhere, and they have proved to a demonstration the excellent character of the instruction they have received. In respect to the means of obtaining a liberal education our Province stands on a par with any country in the world, and our University is worthy to receive the support of all who value the proper mental training of the young men of the country.

THE UNCOMFORTABLES.

If ever the inner history of the scheming and planning which the Westmoreland Government is making to hold on to office, comes to be written, the public will be astonished if not edified. Every means which their ingenuity can devise is being resorted to in order to strengthen a position which is clearly untenable, except for the shortest possible time. Working with the administration, might and main, is John James Fraser. This gentleman who, only the other day, was so weary of local politics that he courted the crushing defeat he received at the hands of Mr. Pickard, is yet, it report and appearances can be relied on, Chief Fugleman of the Westmoreland Government. He is to him that delicate missions are entrusted; it is his counsel which is sought in every emergency. The public can gather from this how much his protestations of a desire for the retirement are worth. This interference of a person who is not a member of the Assembly in the affairs of the government is indicative of two things. First it shows that Mr. Hanington and his colleagues are unable to manage affairs satisfactorily, and secondly that "the clique" is making a determined effort to retain its grasp upon public patronage. The people everywhere will be glad to learn that there is no doubt whatever of the speedy annihilation of this combination. Meanwhile it is worth while noting the extraordinary policy of the Government. A vacant seat existed, and into it Dr. Lewis was put. Perhaps we ought not to object to so sick an administration calling in the Doctor; but while Dr. Black represents Westmoreland it was surely unnecessary to cross the Petitoediac for another physician. The public can scarcely appreciate the fine distinction between the two Doctors. All sorts of rumors are afloat. The crowding out process is being applied to Mr. Crawford, but so far without any result. Mr. McLeod has been made to feel that his room is better than his company, and of late a horrible rumor has arisen that it is the Premier himself, the saviour of Fredericton, who is thought to be the Jonah. Another calumnious report is that Mr. W. E. Perley is to be discharged. In fact each day brings its fresh batch of rumors, but as each day adds to the strength of the Opposition.

WHAT NEXT?

With the capture of Alexandria, the difficulties of the Egyptian problem have only begun. It was a comparatively easy matter for the British fleet to anchor in the port, and when Arabi refused to come to terms, batter down his defences. It is not difficult to hold the Suez Canal, or, if need be, send an army to drive the maimed into the desert. A fleet and an army can accomplish this; but when it is done, what next? All observers of events foresee that sooner or later British interests in Egypt would make it necessary that British influence should be not only paramount on the banks of the Nile, but undisturbed. It was evident that the anomalous political status which had been maintained could not be continued, and that the supremacy of the Sultan would be disputed as well by the foreign residents, who were rapidly increasing in numbers, as by the leaders of the native Egyptians. The long impending crisis has come. It is clear that there cannot be a return to the condition of things which existed three months ago, and even if it should appear that the power and influence of Arabi Bey is at an end, which is by no means to be taken for granted, the British Government will feel called upon to take steps to prevent a recurrence of existing difficulties. The course which the Sultan has taken is inexplicable. In the multitude of his counsellors he has found perplexity; and he has contrived to secure for himself nothing except the distrust of those whose confidence his interests would lead him to desire. The most feasible solution of the difficulty would appear to be to put an end to the suzerainty of the Sultan over Egypt, and establish a government under the direct protection of Great Britain, in which prominence could be given to the so-called national idea. If the people have any aspirations towards self-government they should be encouraged, and it is presumed that they would receive the sympathy of a Liberal British administration.

Some may ask why Great Britain is so greatly interested in Egypt. In interest arises in several ways. Its first place, the government of the Khedive was the creation of France and England; in the second place, a large portion of the Egyptian public debt is due to Englishmen; in the third place, Great Britain is the owner of a large number of shares in the Suez Canal; in the fourth place, the control of Egypt implies the control of the highway to India; and in the fifth place, as the chief commercial nation in the world she must preserve the canal free from the arbitrary interference of a semi-civilized dictator. Of the tonnage passing through the canal fully three-fourths is British. The European powers recognize the peculiar obligations which Great Britain is under to preserve a government at Cairo, in which civilized nations will have confidence, and she will probably be left to work out the problem, just as the great guns of her fleet were permitted to speak on behalf of all Europe.

A DEATH-BED REPENTANCE.

"The personnel of the staff of a journal is the last thing we desire to say anything about." The Farmer quotes this sentence from the Herald and, with it for a text, proceeds to assail us for some observations in respect to the responsibility of the British flag. The European powers recognize the peculiar obligations which Great Britain is under to preserve a government at Cairo, in which civilized nations will have confidence, and she will probably be left to work out the problem, just as the great guns of her fleet were permitted to speak on behalf of all Europe.

NOT NIPPED.

The following letter from Professor Weldon explains itself. That those who have any interest in the matter may know between whom the contradiction comes, we will state that when the Rev. Mr. Evans brought the subject up, the Rev. Mr. Burwash stated that he knew exactly to whom allusion was made, and that he "had that gentleman's word, unsolicited, that were he to remain in connection with the institution for twenty years longer, a like occurrence would not take place." The following is the letter:—

WESLEYAN COLLEGE,
Sackville, July 12, 1882.

MR. EDITOR,—My attention has been called to a paragraph in your issue of July 6th, entitled, "Nipped in the Bud." It contains a statement which I feel bound to say that no one had any warrant to give any assurance to the Conference "that I would not give similar cause for complaint in future."

My conduct during the late political campaign in Westmoreland was deliberate. I did what I thought right. As to the past, I have no apologies to make; as to the future, I have no assurances to offer.

Yours, very truly,
RICHARD C. WELDON.

Prof. Weldon states his position with great fairness, and it remains for those who have the supervision of the institution to play the part of stump orators at elections. Prof. Weldon says that he did what he thought was right. No one disputes this; the question which the Methodist denomination is interested in, is whether he did what was expedient in the interests of an institution which ought not in any way to be identified with politics, and whether they can afford to run the risk of a repetition of such conduct. Some action would undoubtedly have been taken at the late Conference if it had not been for the statement made by Mr. Burwash. It has become necessary now that some rule should be adopted for the future government of the Sackville Professors, because if a great deal of mischief will be done if one becomes understood that the institution is likely to become a political head-quarters. In the absence of any rule to the contrary, no one can say that Prof. Weldon's conduct has been censurable. He has violated no obligation, except one which was implied when he accepted his professorship, namely, that he would do nothing to detract from the usefulness of the institution. He probably believes that his conduct is not calculated to have that effect, but if he does, he will be nearly alone in his opinion.

RECENTLY the public have been informed upon several occasions that it is the intention of influential Liberals in Ontario to start a newspaper to take the place of the Toronto Globe as the leading Liberal journal in Canada. To start the paper is easy enough; but to supplant the Globe is quite another matter. The objection which is made to our Toronto contemporary is, that it is not in harmony with Mr. Blake and the majority of the Liberals, and does not recognize that there has been any change in public opinion, as manifested in the views held by the party which it supports. It is claimed that the Globe arrogates to itself the right to dictate to its party. If this is so it is an unfortunate thing for the Liberals; but although there have been instances lately when the course taken

"NIPPED IN THE BUD."

Commenting upon the remarks made in the Herald in reference to the Sackville Professor who stumped the County of Westmoreland for Mr. Wood, the Transcript says:

Unfortunately it was not "nipped in the bud." Professor Weldon was allowed to pursue, and did pursue, his partisan career as stump orator for the Tories, as long as he could be of service to their cause. There can be no doubt that grave and permanent injury has been done by the conduct of Prof. Weldon in the premises. It has, we are informed, in more than one instance, led parents who had intended sending their children to the Sackville institutions, to decide to send them elsewhere. As to the "assurances" that were given to the Conference that the offense would not be repeated, we have no means of knowing whether or not Prof. Weldon authorized such assurances to be made. At any rate it is rather a cheap way of getting out of a difficulty, by promising to do differently five years hence. Upon the same subject the Moncton Times says:

Rev. Mr. Evans appears to have thought it necessary to bring up Westmoreland politics and the action of one of the Sackville professors, in the late Methodist Conference. It is not denied, we think, that ministers take a more or less active part in politics, on one side or the other. Mr. Evans not excepted, and why should not a college professor have even greater freedom? Perhaps Mr. Evans objected to the side taken by the Professor in question rather than to the action itself.

This is a nasty insinuation for even the Times to make, and it does Mr. Evans a great injustice. If ministers of the Gospel cannot speak of matters concerning the internal economy of the church, with which they are connected, without subjecting themselves to the insults of papers like the Times, things have come to a pretty pass. Mr. Evans does not take an active part in politics, further than to vote, when it suits the sovereign pleasure of the person who prepares the voters' lists to put his name upon the poll book.

NOT NIPPED.

The following letter from Professor Weldon explains itself. That those who have any interest in the matter may know between whom the contradiction comes, we will state that when the Rev. Mr. Evans brought the subject up, the Rev. Mr. Burwash stated that he knew exactly to whom allusion was made, and that he "had that gentleman's word, unsolicited, that were he to remain in connection with the institution for twenty years longer, a like occurrence would not take place." The following is the letter:—

WESLEYAN COLLEGE,
Sackville, July 12, 1882.

MR. EDITOR,—My attention has been called to a paragraph in your issue of July 6th, entitled, "Nipped in the Bud." It contains a statement which I feel bound to say that no one had any warrant to give any assurance to the Conference "that I would not give similar cause for complaint in future."

My conduct during the late political campaign in Westmoreland was deliberate. I did what I thought right. As to the past, I have no apologies to make; as to the future, I have no assurances to offer.

Yours, very truly,
RICHARD C. WELDON.

Prof. Weldon states his position with great fairness, and it remains for those who have the supervision of the institution to play the part of stump orators at elections. Prof. Weldon says that he did what he thought was right. No one disputes this; the question which the Methodist denomination is interested in, is whether he did what was expedient in the interests of an institution which ought not in any way to be identified with politics, and whether they can afford to run the risk of a repetition of such conduct. Some action would undoubtedly have been taken at the late Conference if it had not been for the statement made by Mr. Burwash. It has become necessary now that some rule should be adopted for the future government of the Sackville Professors, because if a great deal of mischief will be done if one becomes understood that the institution is likely to become a political head-quarters. In the absence of any rule to the contrary, no one can say that Prof. Weldon's conduct has been censurable. He has violated no obligation, except one which was implied when he accepted his professorship, namely, that he would do nothing to detract from the usefulness of the institution. He probably believes that his conduct is not calculated to have that effect, but if he does, he will be nearly alone in his opinion.

RECENTLY the public have been informed upon several occasions that it is the intention of influential Liberals in Ontario to start a newspaper to take the place of the Toronto Globe as the leading Liberal journal in Canada. To start the paper is easy enough; but to supplant the Globe is quite another matter. The objection which is made to our Toronto contemporary is, that it is not in harmony with Mr. Blake and the majority of the Liberals, and does not recognize that there has been any change in public opinion, as manifested in the views held by the party which it supports. It is claimed that the Globe arrogates to itself the right to dictate to its party. If this is so it is an unfortunate thing for the Liberals; but although there have been instances lately when the course taken

by the great Toronto daily did not accord with what, in our humble judgment, as the Irrepressible would say, seemed to be for the best interests of the party, we are, nevertheless, of the opinion that the views of the Globe generally are in harmony with those held by the Liberals of the Maritime Provinces.

A GRACELESS JOURNAL.

We fear that the Toronto World has fallen from grace. It heads an article with the following title: "My Lord Bishops on their Ear," and proceeded to discuss the Metropolitan question after this style:—

It is not a little ridiculous to see these mock ecclesiastical dignitaries quarrelling among themselves about their brummagan titles. How very careful the organs of high church episcopalianism are never to mention a bishop without dragging in the inevitable "my lord." And yet Hallam, the highest authority on English constitutional law has emphatically declared that no colonial bishop has a right to the title "my lord." The English bishops are lords, simply because they are peers of the realm, because under the feudal system they hold lands and occupy the position of feudal barons.

After speaking of the probable determination of the "ecclesiastical Boss Tweed," as it calls the Archbishop of Canterbury, and berating church dignitaries generally, the World concludes as follows:—

"Anglican" ecclesiasticism is saturated with intolerance and vanity, of which the proceedings at the Montreal synod are a typical example. While persons quarrel with each other about absurd titles and the Lord Bishop of Bankswill applies for an injunction to prevent the Grand Panjandrum of Fredericton from putting himself into "small caps" as "THE METROPOLITAN," let sensible men remember that the best weapon against these absurd pretensions to the Canadian and illegal titles by a clique of clerical snobs is a hearty laugh.

We think our contemporary is unnecessarily harsh. No one supposes that the titles of "Lord" and "Metropolitan" mean anything. As long as the present incumbents of the Canadian bishoprics occupy their positions there can be no harm in continuing to address them by their titles. We do not imagine that any discourtesy is intended to the bishops of Montreal or Fredericton, for whom the World must, in common with other Canadian journals, entertain that high respect which their great learning and exemplary lives entitle them to receive. Its attack is against the assumption of titles which imply do not appertain to the parties who bear them. In any effort which it may make to break down distinctions between religious denominations in Canada, the World will receive the sympathy of the great body of the people; but it should distinguish between ridiculing a system and speaking disrespectfully of individuals. We do not say that it has not done so in the article from which we have quoted, but many persons might think it has not.

TITLES.

Titles ought not to thrive in Canadian soil. They would speedily fall into disuse if it were not for the newspapers, but as long as the names of public men appear in print with a handle on one side, like a water picher, or on both sides, like a tub, just so long will titles be considered as worth something. To a well-balanced mind there is something absurd in always referring to Jonathan Jenkins as the Honorable Jonathan Jenkins, M. P., Q. C., or, if he happens once upon a time to have been in a government, to call him ever after the Hon. Jonathan Jenkins. To use a common expression, the woods are full of honorables. The habit is an absurd one and indicates bad taste. If a Canadian paper is writing of the Premier of England it speaks of Mr. Gladstone, and very often drops the Mr.; but when our domestic great guns are spoken of the whole alphabet is summoned to express their dignity. A table of procedure has been prepared by the Grand High Cockalorum of the British Empire, in which it is specified who is to be called "honorable" and who not; but this table is only recognized in this country by courtesy and might be ignored with advantage. One sometimes sees this absurdity of titles carried to an astonishing limit. We have seen in contemporary descriptions of some trivial affair at which the Hon. that, this Esquire, Mr. the other, and plain somebody else, with neither bowsprit or rudder, were announced as being present. All this absurd distinction would be avoided if newspapers would adopt the rule of speaking of persons simply by their names and disregarding titles whenever it is possible to do so. There is no more reason why one should always write the premier's name Sir John A. Macdonald than there is why one should perpetually address him by his title in conversation. But some may ask, would you ignore titles altogether? Our reply is yes. The people of Canada cannot prevent the Home Government conferring titles, nor persons here from accepting them; but they can do a great deal in that direction by simply, when they speak of people in the press, calling them plain John Smith, or Thomas Brown, or whatever else their cognomen may be.

The climax of the absurdity is capped when the title is extended to the wife of an individual who happens to hold an office which entitles him to a handle on the front end of his name. We have heard of Mrs. Judge So-and-so, of Mrs.

Speaker So-and-so, of Mrs. Attorney General So-and-so. There may be nothing out of the way in applying such terms occasionally in conversation, where it is necessary to distinguish the person who is meant; but to use them in newspaper, and, especially, as some journals do, as though the ladies to whose names they are affixed, had a right to be so styled, is in very bad taste indeed. Mrs. Justice of the Peace Robinson, or Mrs. Commissioner-for-taking affidavits-in-the-Supreme Court Jenkins, would be as much in place as some of the terms used.

The final results of the Canadian elections is that in a House of 211 members the Government has a majority of nearly two to one. Thus, after four years' trial, the Canadian people have pronounced in favor of the maintenance of Protection. It is the main question separating parties in the Dominion, and of course was the point at issue in the elections just decided. As we all remember, the Canadians are emphatic in the declaration that the adoption of Protection is not directed against this country, but is an act of supposed self-defence against the United States. The United States keep up an exorbitant protective tariff, not only against Europeans, but also against their American neighbors, and show not the slightest inclination towards the erection of a Zollverein, in spite of the pretension of some politicians among them to a kind of protectorate over the smaller States of the continent. The example of the United States in this matter is exercising a misleading influence upon nations throughout the world. Because the United States have enjoyed unparalleled prosperity in spite of Protection, it is assumed that the prosperity is a result of Protection, and one country after another is renouncing Free Trade in the hope of fostering national industry and promoting the well-being of its people. The real truth is that the prosperity of the United States would have been much greater had they adopted Free Trade long ago; and Canada by the unwise course it is now pursuing is doing its best to retard its own progress, and to obstruct the development of the great grain-growing districts of Manitoba. Moreover, Canadians are putting a strain upon their connection with this country by the imposition of protective duties. As we have already said, they are loud in their protestations that these duties are not directed against the United Kingdom, but as a matter of fact they are levied upon British goods as well as on foreign—and a prohibitive tariff against foreign subjects is such an anomaly that sooner or later it may prove too great a strain upon the connection between the two countries.—London Daily News.

CANADIAN NEWS.

The Grand Trunk Railway will take possession of the Great Western on the 12th of August.

During the month of June, the quantity of water pumped at the water works, Ottawa, was 79,699,000 gallons.

Rev. Mr. McKeown was presented with an address on the occasion of his taking leave of Exmouth street church.

Work upon the highway bridge across the St. John at Anderson, will be begun as soon as the water is low enough.

The Winnipeg assessors say that the city assessment will tote up something like thirty millions. For 1881 it was nine millions.

The people of Rat Portage vote in the County of Algoma, Ontario, and the County of L'Assomption, Quebec. This is one of the results of the disputed territory muddle.

There was a stampede from St. Vincent to Pentitentiary, Montreal, on Thursday last, and one of the prisoners who refused to stop when ordered was fired at and shot through the body.

The exports from Belleville to the United States for the quarter ending June 30th were of a total value of \$462,516.44; for the same quarter last year, \$330,955.33; an increase of \$131,561.09. The principal item was 10,677,995 feet of lumber. The shipment of iron ore was 5,353 gross tons. The amount of cheese shipped to England so far this season is about 25,000 boxes.

The Moncton Transcript says: On Tuesday evening, 27th ult., Mr. W. B. McKenzie, of the I. C. Railway, had a large leather valise, containing valuable papers, taken from the platform of the depot. He advertised the missing article, and agreed to pay for its recovery, but, notwithstanding that, the party could not be induced to bring it back. At last the case was placed in the hands of Detective Skeffington, whose shrewdness in such matters has proved him to be a most valuable official to the railway. The detective proceeded to New Mills last night, and entered a boarding house owned by a Mrs. Wilson. A search in the room of the suspected party—a young man named Asa Nickerson, whose family are quite respectable—confirmed the officer's suspicion. A tag bearing the name of Mr. McKenzie was found on the floor, and subsequently the thief was arrested at the mill, where he was sitting with a number of others. The prisoner at first repudiated any knowledge of the valise, but at last "cracked up," and took the officer some distance in the woods, where he had it secreted, and produced it.