

THE BULLFROG.

No. 5.

OCTOBER 1, 1864.

PRICE 2 CENTS.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—We cannot notice anonymous communications. Parties desirous of obtaining the BULLFROG will oblige us by sending their names and address for the information of our carriers. Subscriptions, 25 cents per quarter, payable in advance. Advertisements inserted at the usual terms. X. Y. Z., Office, 111, Barrington Street.

POLITICS A-LA-MODE.

When Gulliver visited the Mathematical School of Lagado, he found the master teaching his pupils after a method scarce imaginable to Europeans. "The proposition and demonstration were fairly written on a thin wafer, with ink composed of a cephalic tincture. This the student was to swallow upon a fasting stomach, and for three days following eat nothing but bread and water. As the wafer digested, the tincture mounted to his brain, bearing the proposition along with it." But the success of this method of teaching had not, up to the time of Gulliver's visit, been very great, inasmuch as the nauseousness of the bolus caused the scholars to reject it, "neither had they yet been persuaded to use so long an abstinence as the prescription required." It would seem that the political teachers of this Province have been endeavouring to instil the theories of the English form of Government into the minds of the people, by a somewhat similar process, having a precisely similar success. It is just probable that were we to shut out from our mind during a period of—say twenty years—all political nourishment save that prescribed by our local teachers, we should eventually comprehend the political theories of our rulers. But we fear we should be tempted to imitate the perverseness of the Lagado youths and rebel against so prolonged and unnatural an abstinence. To do full justice to prescriptions so unique, would be virtually impossible, inasmuch as we should have not merely to put out our eyes, and destroy our sense of hearing, but also to unseat memory from our brain,—a proceeding difficult of accomplishment save by suicide. So long as memory held a seat in our brain, we should be recalling the political histories of Great Britain, the Federal States, and other countries, and such recollections would tend to upset the theories forced upon us by new-fangled practitioners. We have been subjected to a good deal of curious treatment for some time back, and are already beginning to doubt the practical wisdom of our political teachers. Men are slow to believe that the dismissal from public employ of a man who had faithfully served his country for a quarter of a century, is a transaction calculated to set forth the beauties of Responsible Government, or to reflect honor upon a constitution modelled upon that of the land we love. We are yet young in our political youth does not necessarily go far to illustrate our political little Lieutenant Governor at Pictou, assion upon the broad principles intentions of the QUEEN'S Representative advisers, whereas an alleged want of a Light-House keeper, was seized acriminious party warfare. One

of our leading political journals makes use of a Light-House keeper in the most ingenious manner:—"We say it is pitiful to see any man exhibiting himself in such a position, but"—now we have it,—"what shall we say of a once great party when we see them reduced to the contemptible alternative of denouncing their own declared principles, contemning their own practice, and degrading themselves in a vain attempt to overthrow the first principles of Responsible Government, to relieve the Cabinet from all accountability to the country, and to drag the Crown into a baleful collision with the people." This paragraph, although disfigured by fewer grammatical errors than the minute upon "Tenure of Office," is in fair keeping with the contents of that ever memorable blue book, to which we called attention in a former issue. The wisdom which connects the political career of a Light-House keeper with a baleful collision between the Crown and the people, is exactly on a par with the wisdom which elevates every man wearing a decent coat to the position of a dangerous political partizan. But such wisdom is too profound to be altogether convincing, and we are sanguine enough to hope that no immediate danger to the Crown is to be feared on account of one man's determined liberalism. The Light-House service, although of great importance, is but a small item in our yearly expenditure (something over £1000 sterling,) and the number of hands therein employed are insufficient to organize any very disastrous revolution. But the denouncement of formerly declared principles by a "once great party" marks an epoch in our history worthy of consideration, and it behoves us to examine attentively the soundness, or unsoundness of principles thus hastily discarded. The journal from which we quote sums up such principles in the following words:—"After the general election in 1855, several members of the late government boldly avowed on the floor of Parliament the doctrine that 'to the victors belonged the spoils,' and advocated the propriety of displacing all office holders who were not the partizans of the Government from office." As the tendencies of such advocacy seem to us rather pernicious than otherwise, we are inclined to regard the recantation of the doctrine in a light the reverse of gloomy, nor can we find it in our hearts to accept such recantation as a fair ground for censure. The existing Administration, being Conservative, must be averse to endorsing a theory so novel and republican: consequently, it seems the more strange that the reputed Government organ should taunt the opposition for discarding Anti-Conservative doctrines. Such conduct on the part of the leading Conservative journal would appear inconsistent, were it not that, in the case under consideration, the journal in question attempts to justify on behalf of the Conservatives, a system which it condemns on behalf of the Liberals. The Liberals advocated an unwise doctrine in 1855, which the Conservatives "strongly controverted" as "republican." But, in 1864, the Conservatives, it would seem, not only carry out the obnoxious "republican" doctrine, but taunt the Liberals for having renounced it! We cannot at present understand all this, nor are we, in order to do so, disposed to enter upon