The Weekly Mail.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, APRIL 21, 1876. PRICE FOUR CENTS.

VOL. V. NO. 212.

THE WORK OF THE SESSION.

THE Speech delivered at the opening of the Session which has just closed, has evoked the hard times which had fallen upon the country—"The great depression which has prevailed throughout "the neighbouring countries for several "years, and which has more recently "been felt in the Old World, causing "general stagnation of business, has extended to Canada and seriously affected "our trade." The Speech delivered at the closing, expresses the hope that "increased commercial prosperity" will follow the legislation of the Session. How is this? Stagnation prevailed universally when Parliament met, how, then, can there be an increase of prosperity, seeing that there was no prosperity to begin with? The Government indeed had it in its power to relieve, if not to remove, the prevailing suffering. The best business men in the country pointed out the way. The farmers petitioned that the Government itself let it be understood that it was about to grant relief to the depressed classes; but all the Ministerial men Mr. CARTWRIGHT looked back, and instead of the suffering being relieved by a vigorous and heroic policy, the distress was intensified by disappointment and distrust. And yet we are asked to be hopeful of a "continued increase of "prosperity"! Has the bill suspending the enfranchisement of Indians, or the election law amendment, or the criminal statistics measure, restored confidence in commercial circles, or enabled our merchants and manufacturers to compete on even terms with those in the United States? Those are the only Government measures thought worthy of being mentioned in the Speech which would have had any tendency to the general stagnation of business which prevailed when the Session opened.

On what grounds, then, is his Excellency made to speak of "increased commercial prosperity"? And if it be not *ours*, may we enquire, is it not in grim sarcasm that he is made to express the hope that the labours of his faithful Commons "out of session may be as useful "and beneficial as they have been during "the their attendance in Parliament"! Indian enfranchisement, a small election law amendment, and a bill for the collection of criminal statistics, this is indeed a class of measures for the relief of the general stagnation of trade which could easily be equalled in or "out of "session" by any Township Council in the country!

SIR JOHN MACDONALD AND MR. BLAKE.

THE *Globe* of Saturday took up a column in asking and answering the question—What did Sir JOHN MACDONALD accomplish during the session? And it is particularly pleased to be able to say that he accomplished nothing by way of adding an appendix to the "big pink" letter. But how could he? He is in the Commons, while the sender and receiver of the famous letter-missive are members of the Upper Chamber. Moreover Mr. BROWN was out of the country; and what sermons on British fair play would have been preached had one of the Opposition Senators moved for an investigation in the absence of the country! Well the *Globe* is in a mood to be tickled with small straws when it can rejoice that the connection between Mr. BROWN's bribery letter and the Government was not made manifest by the formulæ of an examination in Committee. Enough, we think, was proved by the letter itself to satisfy the most implacable of Mr. BROWN's enemies. It wrote him down a hypocrite, who had publicly traded on professions of purity and on the condemnation of the sins of others while covertly asking at the same time, and paying for an organization devoted to the purpose of bribery and corruption.

But if Sir JOHN MACDONALD failed for the reasons just stated to "paint the "lily" in the BROWN-SIMPSON case, he was able to do his share as leader of the Opposition to the great advantage of the public business and in a manner highly honourable to himself and his party. Throughout, he was a statesman. Unlike his opponents when they were in Opposition, he never allowed the Government to assume that because they were in Opposition, they had in their hands a Divine commission to do what they pleased. The Premier must therefore be held responsible for the some which took place on the last day of the session, and which led to the abolition of the official report.

The Canadian *Hansard* may have been open to objection, but the experience of two years amply demonstrates that it was a great mistake to abolish it. The Government saw amply that it was not a paying concern. We might venture to hope that the Premier would be self-consistent that the necessity of making official explanations leaves members of the Administration in a position to do extent from which, by virtue of their comparative freedom from responsibility, Opposition members are much more exempt. However this may can be no doubt that as respects consistency Mr. MACKENZIE is a grievous sinner. We do not think, however, we are far astray in attributing the death of the *Hansard* mainly to him. Had he desired a different fate for it, it is impossible to doubt that with the large scolding, not to say servile, majority, he has at his back, he would have defeated Mr. HOLTON, even if under such circumstances the member for Chateauguay were disposed to be the pugnacious. The Premier must therefore be held responsible for the some which took place on the last day of the session, and which led to the abolition of the official report.

The Canadian *Hansard* may have been open to objection, but the experience of two years amply demonstrates that it was a great mistake to abolish it. The Government saw amply that it was not a paying concern. We might venture to hope that the Premier would be self-consistent that the necessity of making official explanations leaves members of the Administration in a position to do extent from which, by virtue of their comparative freedom from responsibility, Opposition members are much more exempt. However this may can be no doubt that as respects consistency Mr. MACKENZIE is a grievous sinner. We do not think, however, we are far astray in attributing the death of the *Hansard* mainly to him. Had he desired a different fate for it, it is impossible to doubt that with the large scolding, not to say servile, majority, he has at his back, he would have defeated Mr. HOLTON, even if under such circumstances the member for Chateauguay were disposed to be the pugnacious. The Premier must therefore be held responsible for the some which took place on the last day of the session, and which led to the abolition of the official report.

APPOINTMENTS.

A CANADIAN Senator who voluntarily absents himself from the body of which he is a member for two years *ipso facto* vacates his seat. Two men whose names have been enrolled among the members of the Senate have chosen, by remaining away for that time, to withdraw from the Upper House—Sir EDWARD KENNY and M. DELESIT. We believe Mr. ROBERTSON of New Brunswick has also ceased to be a member of the Senate, having left Canada and taken up his residence in England. During the session the Ministerial Party were speculating on who, in Ontario vacancy, a Senator from this Province of the advanced age of eighty-eight years having been taken seriously ill while pluckily attending to his sessional duties. Rumour has it that, should a vacancy occur in this Province, it is the intention of the Premier to fill it by the appointment of Mr. *Joseph Cauchon*, of Kingston. To do so would be to continue to violate the understanding entered into in 1864 by the leaders of the coalitive Parties who formed the coalition of that year, viz., that as vacancies occurred in the Senate the members of the Legislative Council who would necessarily be dropped in 1867 should have preference to our men. Mr. CAUCHON has not government appointed Mr. PENNY and M. FABRE in Quebec, and Mr. GEORGE BROWN in Ontario—all three men who claim to that fame for which he so ardently longed. Of all his writings the poems of the poet appeal to him. It filled his defeat at Edinburgh. But notwithstanding its literary defects it is the one so much more esteemed by the author. Throughout his poems we see that he has a great ambition, and that he has a great desire to be ranked among the poets. He has such as triumphs over the promptings of gratitude, admiration, interest, fear, to yet capable of imparting to writing a zest which nothing else can give. While illustrating and enforcing this somewhat exaggerated statement of his claim for it by saying, among other things, that we are always desirous of knowing something of the character and situation of those who are our benefactors, and that we love and stimulated our thoughts. About any man who does anything bad, good or indifferent, we are curious to know. The confessions of a vulgar murderer are read with intense interest. The columns of the Toronto newspapers in the time were a few days ago full of details about a dry goods merchant who died in Montreal, and why? Why? Because it is natural to desire to know the particulars of a life which has been out of the common, something the affection sense and solicitude about it, when the subject is one whose thoughts have been an part of our own mental fibre; whose free and natural the blood; whose joys have caused drops of sorrow to fall; whose spoil has, for the time, given solace to the wounded heart, and under whose guidance we have climbed the "starry spiral of "science" or wandered over the fields of "poetry and romance." Perhaps the modern writer of serious literature has been so widely read as MACAULAY; none have had more admirers; there is none whose influence on literature and on the youth of his time has been greater. Not to speak of the critical edition of his works in America, leaving out the vast circulation of his essays, we may gather some idea of his extraordinary popularity from the fact that while a generation after the first appearance, upwards of "140,000 "copies of the History will have "been printed and sold in the "United Kingdom alone." In 1856 Lord MACAULAY himself wrote: "This "work is wonderful. Twenty-six thousand "hundred copies sold in ten weeks." The life of such a man was naturally evidently desired to spend the winter of his days on the other side of the water.

THE WINSLOW CASE.

A WASHINGTON despatch says that Secretary FISH has sent to Mr. HOFFMAN, Chargé d'Affaires at London, an official note, informing him that the United States cannot agree to any circumstances take cognizance of the British Act of 1870 touching extradition treaties, and peremptorily refusing to give any assurance whatever that WINSLOW, if delivered over to American authority, shall not be tried for any crime other than that of forgery, on which his extradition is now asked for. This brings the two Governments to a deadlock in the matter, and creates a diplomatic situation of unusual gravity. Mr. FISH has made no secret of his opinion that the British Government had taken up a position from which it could not recede. The extradition treaty of many years ago it holds to be very insufficient, because it does not secure that persons extradited shall be tried only on the charges for and that they preferred against them, and no other. In 1870 Great Britain by a municipal Act of Parliament passed for the express purpose of administration under this restriction, but there was no alteration in treaty stipulations with the United States, and the latter Power declines to be bound by anything not expressly nominated in the bond.

The position taken by the Government of Washington is not creditable to a nation that boasts of its love of freedom, and of its being, in the van of political progress. Even should it appear that it is in this case technically in the right, it would still be in the wrong. The British Americans would better sustain their reputation as a free people and lovers of liberty, if, instead of hiding behind a servilely liberal position of the British Government, they were to sustain it themselves on this side of the border. It is not the contention for human rights Great Britain ought to receive the support and not the opposition of the United States, but strange to say the latter Power takes the side that we should expect to see taken only by the despots of Europe. As far as the delivery of English and American criminals respectively is concerned, there is not much danger of any of them being claimed on a charge of forgery, for instance, and then put upon trial for a political offence. But on the Continent of Europe the danger of this being done is considerable, and Great Britain feels herself bound to guard against it. She is obliged to day to maintain a certain position as against the United States, because, if she does not, she cannot with any consistency maintain it as against Russia or Germany to-morrow. The task in which she is engaged, that of wresting from mere political persecution those who have been guilty of no crime, properly so called, is one that she feels to be dear to the sympathy of every American, whether he calls himself a Republican or a Democrat. Instead of "Columbia, the "bird of freedom" is found sustaining a competition which, if upheld, might have enabled the Holy Alliance, Government of Europe, to spread the winter of his days on the other side of the water.

M. GAMBETTA ON THE FUTURE OF FRANCE.

M. GAMBETTA's speech at Lyons was a remarkable utterance, and we see in it an indication, not only of the progress of his own mind towards moderation and maturity, but of the happy change which has taken place in France under the moderating influence of Republican Lyons, the great manufacturing centre of France, in one of the most stately of cities, nature and art, antiquity and modern improvements, having combined to make it beautiful to see, and rich in fruitful associations. Rainy and foggy and smoky is the weather, and unpoetical is the fine manufacturing town, but when the weather is fine, and a light breeze sweeps the smoke away from the blue of the enchanting Southern sky, and rallies on the Heights of Fourvières and climbed to the dome of Notre Dame, the view is enough to make a poet bend beneath him in all its beauty and order and life, the two noble rivers on which it is so beautifully sweeping, the bridges under a score of bridges, through a wilderness of architecture, and stretching beyond, fields, valleys, and hills dotted with country houses, the view being bounded on three sides by the Alps, including Mont Blanc itself, and on the south by the Alps of Dauphiné and the mountains of the Cevennes. Hence, He sees the Saone come from its home in the Vosges, full of Middle Age traditions, and lose itself in the broad River Rhone, which brings with it the modern spirit from the great Swiss city in which CALVIN taught, and where ROUSSEAU oddly enough found his inspiration for Republicanism. From such an eminence, as it were, do we, in reading the speech of GAMBETTA, see the physical features of the country, and two great streams of political thought, stretching away into widely different directions in the past, but meeting in the present and merging into wiser and more fruitful as well as juster political views than those of old.

M. GAMBETTA refers to the principles of '89, but it is in the tone of a man who has nothing in common with the political fanaticism whose dangerous strength FYFE so completely failed to understand. He speaks of the Republic as the "Right" of the public, and with vigour against the clerical spirit in politics; but his calm and statesmanlike discussion has nothing in common with the revolutionary sentiment which declared that things would never be right until the vinegrips of the last king were twisted round the neck of the priest. Four years ago, the Republic was not made from the viscera of the last priest. For two hundred and fifty years France was the laughing stock of Europe. The Pope had a divine right to be first and without peer was universally accepted until the other day by Protestants of all shades of politics, and that in defence of this presumed right she was bound to be the slave of Austria. Then, in a war-trumpet. The most moderate politicians maintained that she was entitled to demand from the Government of other nations in the interest of her own pre-eminence. In 1868 GAMBETTA was a very violent Republican, and it was in that year M. PREVOST-PARADOL—an Orleanist and a sage politician, if ever there was one—wrote of GAMBETTA and France out of the Atlantic, but which is a masterpiece, both as regards style and thought. "La France Nouvelle," with this book the learned and accomplished author, and the chief ornament of the *Débats*, prophesied the war between France and Germany in a manner so clear as these: "The reason why this war "must take place is very simple. It is "impossible that Germany should not "resume the effort towards unity, "and it is equally impossible "that France should look on at "an attempt of the kind and not draw "the sword. This eight years ago a moderate politician and great political writer could have given the doctrine that France could not remain passive while another people pursued its development in accordance with its own interest. A contrary opinion dared not have been uttered to a French audience anywhere. The speech of M. GAMBETTA shows that the thoughts of the people as well as his own have undergone during the past year a change, and that the old "Revolution; we can see the narrower policy lost in a wider one which is at once compatible with the progress and prosperity and greatness of France as well as with respect for other nations and European peace.

He came amongst the people of Lyons after the "happy and decisive defeat" of the Administration by "Pastis and Liberté" in France, "in order that he might report on the realistate of the most "tumultuous" democracy in France, and although the elections had not taken place it was clear he "felt in his bones" the further victory that was in store for his party. For five years he contended under various pretences, dynastic and otherwise, "the "true leader of the reactionary coalition, "the authority and guide of all those "dangerous combinations against the "liberty and future prosperity of the "country was clericalism." To that clerical policy which never altered and was never false to itself. Since the speech was delivered at Lyons French from more political persecution those who have been guilty of no crime, properly so called, in one day, and it is to be hoped the sympathy of every American, whether he calls himself a Republican or a Democrat, instead of "Columbia, the "bird of freedom" is found sustaining a competition which, if upheld, might have enabled the Holy Alliance, Government of Europe, to spread the winter of his days on the other side of the water.

LORD MACAULAY.

THE great French critic, SAINTE-BEUVE, said that before he pronounced on an author's works he wanted to know his character and history, and when we so know the character of the man we find not brilliant, which may be accounted for in the same way as his giving up the bar—"I have no stomach for the fight of grain." There was a fine lot of fellows at Cambridge with him. The late Lord Lawrence was one, and some of those times—"When we dined with "MACAULAY and supped with PEEL." Macaulay was a big boy at Cambridge then. DERBY and HOUGHTON, Lord GREY, CHARLES AUSTIN, and others, "the day and night together, was too short for our "intercourse." Macaulay was "a giant in such company." "So long as a door "was open or a light burning in any of "the rooms Macaulay was always in "the mood for conversation and sing "a pantomime." He soon carved a great name for conversational power. In the course of the discussion that this will have stimulated by the fact, though there was no wit of the first order and no "flashes of lightning," still there was great brilliance and power, combined with an awkward delivery. He was a success as an undergraduate. He was a success. While at College he had already formed the habit of reading and thinking for himself, and he was already an Historian. Macaulay, which, in the year of his graduation, which, in the year of his graduation, which, in the year of his graduation