

CALENDAR FOR THE WEEK ENDING MARCH 5, 1870.

SUNDAY, Feb. 27.—QUINQUAGESIMA SUNDAY. Longfellow born, 1807. Administration of Sir John Colborne, 1838.
 MONDAY, " 28.—Montaigne born, 1533. Broussa destroyed by earthquake, 1855.
 TUESDAY, March 1.—SHROVE TUESDAY. St. David.
 WEDNESDAY, " 2.—ASH WEDNESDAY. John Wesley died, 1791.
 THURSDAY, " 3.—Emancipation of Russian Serfs, 1861. Battle of Point-au-Pelée, 1838.
 FRIDAY, " 4.—First American Congress, 1798.
 SATURDAY, " 5.—Fenian rising near Dublin, 1867. Opening of Thames Tunnel, 1843. Layard born, 1817.

THE CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS.

MONTREAL, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1870.

THE debate on the Address, which was concluded on Tuesday, was not one to be admired, or remembered with satisfaction. It was unusually personal and singularly barren of allusion to questions of a practical character. If such questions were discussed at all, it was only in their seeming relation to individual fortune. As a skirmish preliminary to more serious engagements the debate on the Address is always allowed a wide latitude; but it does seem as if this year there has sprung up a more than usually large crop of personal grievances among the people's representatives. And it must be confessed that there are more reasons than usual for this state of feeling. This is the third session of a parliament which, even at the utmost, can survive but two years more. Poor old Dr. Dunlop used to say there were "three sessions given for sin, and one for repentance," under the quadrennial system; but people, now-a-days, read the papers and watch their representatives more closely than was their wont, and who shall say but that some of the members may be already shaping their course with a view to their next hustings speech?

Other circumstances have occurred, such as the change in the personnel of the Government, the North-West question, &c., to leave room for differences of opinion among those who formerly acted in seeming accord; and Mr. Blake has come down from the West strengthened by the formal investiture of the leadership of the Ontario Opposition. Whether he is authorized to supplant Mr. McKenzie in the House of Commons has not been authoritatively stated, but the deposition of Mr. McKellar from the leadership of the Legislative Assembly in his favour gives him additional *clat* that can scarcely fail to have some effect at Ottawa. Some of the Conservative members have objected to Sir Francis Hincks as Minister of Finance; Mr. Cartwright having formally taken up an independent position, and Mr. Bowell assuring the House that his support of the Government would depend solely on their measures. Outside the declarations in open debate, there are rumours of caucuses and new combinations, which, however, may amount to very little. It has so far appeared that with two or three individual exceptions, the relative strength of parties has been but little affected.

From what has yet been said regarding the North-West difficulty it would scarcely be right to form an opinion. It is impossible to doubt that the Hon. Mr. McDougall has evidence which appeared to him satisfactory that some of his colleagues had acted unfairly by him; and it is seemingly as impossible to doubt that such evidence was, in the main, if not altogether, unworthy of credence. For his sake it is to be regretted that he mixed the question of the party basis of the Ontario wing of the Cabinet with his other grievances. At the best, that question affects but a single Province, and there only a few individuals, but the North-West question is of deep interest to the whole Dominion, and the people are equally anxious for a speedy settlement of the difficulty and a thorough understanding of how and by whom it was created. Mr. McDougall's "mission" in Parliament this session is to assist in reaching both these ends; and he only impairs his ability to discharge this duty by raising the party issue. He has declared that his course towards the Government will depend upon the policy to be adopted with reference to the North-West Territory; but as Mr. McDougall has already expressed a preference for what seems, under the circumstances, rather a harsh policy, it is to be hoped that either he will moderate his views, or the Government will not adopt them.

Sir Alexander Galt's going into opposition, though not an unexpected event, is still of such importance as to deserve notice as one of the chief incidents of the debate. Sir Alexander's peculiar views on the subject of independence have been pretty generally, though not very accurately known, at least since the last session of Parliament. These views were communicated to Her Majesty's Government before he accepted the proffered knighthood. They

cannot, therefore, in fairness, be held to be such as to have made it culpable on the part of the Government to offer him his old portfolio on the resignation of Mr. Rose. But they certainly ought to be accounted a complete justification for Sir George E. Cartier's stipulating, along with that offer, that in case the question of independence were mooted in Parliament, the Cabinet must be a unit in opposition to any measure tending to favour it. This was well enough, and from Sir George's strongly pronounced and well-known sentiments on the subject, exactly what was to have been expected. But do not some of the Government supporters go a little too far when they confound Sir Alexander's views with those of the annexationists? It is not only unfair to the man, it is also unjust to the country to attribute the extreme of an opinion, where only a very mild shade is entertained, and that merely as a necessity of the future indefinite. At all events, the independence theory receives very little sympathy in Parliament, and just as little throughout the country; the school of home politicians who favoured the policy have either changed their creed or become dumb, and the question is little likely now to arrest the serious attention of the mass of the people, who are rightly persuaded that independence under present circumstances would be but the prelude to annexation.

From the number and variety of personal issues introduced in this debate, it takes no prophet to foretell a stormy session. The re-appearance of Sir Francis Hincks on the floor of the Canadian Parliament is an event well calculated to excite a warmer interest in the proceedings, and may have contributed not a little to the revival of almost forgotten feuds. Mr. McDougall's position, too, with his right to his seat questioned, though we think unreasonably, is such as to attract attention; while Sir Alexander Galt's going into opposition, and the defection of one or two western Conservatives, are all incidents calculated to magnify the personal phase of Parliamentary proceedings. But beyond these personal matters, to which the country will get accustomed in a week, and which it will almost have forgotten in a month, there are serious questions of national policy which should command the best judgment of the Legislature. It may be as well, therefore, that the debate on the address took so wide a range, as there will be the less excuse hereafter for members bringing up their personal affairs while discussing public questions.

It is reported from Ottawa that the Hon. Dr. Tupper is gaining many adherents to his policy for giving the Americans a taste of reciprocity in tariffs so long as they refuse us reciprocity in trade. There would be grave difficulty in the way of enforcing a tariff discriminating against any one nation, but fortunately there are geographical as well as commercial reasons precluding the necessity for a resort to such a course, even were Dr. Tupper's policy to be carried out to the letter. Of the articles which Dr. Tupper would remove from the free list, *i. e.*, grain of all kinds, flour and meal, coal, and perhaps, salt, the two latter only are imported into Canada from other countries than the United States, so that the imposition of a duty upon those articles, no matter whence imported, would have the practical effect of applying to the American trade, just as their tariff applies to ours. There is really nothing to be gained in Canada by putting a duty on American grain. In the Eastern Townships and along the whole dividing line this duty would operate to the advantage of the local producer perhaps; but if it did so it would manifestly be at the expense of the local consumer. If, on the other hand, a duty is imposed on American flour with the view to force a trade between the Maritime and the Western Provinces, and also a duty on American coal to force the latter into purchasing their supplies from the former, then the question becomes merely one of balancing accounts between two sections of the Dominion; and it has this decided disadvantage that in the West the consumers of coal are not the producers of grain; and that in the East the coal producers form an exceedingly small proportion of the grain consumers. Would a trade between the Provinces, forced by such a tariff, be productive of general satisfaction, or even national benefit? Will the fishermen of Nova Scotia be pleased to pay more for their flour in order that the coal owners of that Province should derive a larger profit from their mines? Will the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec and other consumers of coal be pleased to pay more for their fuel, by twelve and a half or fifteen per cent. in order that the grain and flour of Western Canada be forced into a particular market wherein the producer will not even have the advantage of higher prices? The price of grain in Canada is regulated not by the Canadian markets, nor by any thing that a Canadian import duty can accomplish, but by the great grain markets of the world, to which Canada, after supplying all local demands, has a large annual surplus to export.

The state of feeling on the border is one which ought

not to be lost sight of. So long as the Canadian can cross the line and buy grain, coal, or other produce, and bring it into Canada duty free, he can scarcely divest himself of the notion that he is living under a more liberal system than that prevailing among our neighbours. But if at the many contiguous points between the two countries Canada begins to erect barriers against mutual trade, unpleasant feelings will be excited on both sides, and especially on the side of Canada, because in many localities, notwithstanding the high duties which the Americans exact, Canadians, for geographical or other reasons, find it more profitable to dispose of their produce in the near American, than in the more distant Canadian, markets. The local trade to which we have referred would doubtless be considerably disturbed by the proposed retaliatory policy; the coal trade of Nova Scotia might be to some extent benefited, but we doubt exceedingly whether it would not be the wiser policy to avoid any cause of hostility, in that Province, by a tax on the poor man's bread, than to seek for gratitude by conferring a bounty on the produce of the rich man's coal-field. The question is a complicated one, and should be decided solely in the interests of Canada, by a fair balancing of the advantages and the disadvantages on both sides. We have indicated the several considerations to be taken into the account, but cannot very confidently pronounce upon the weight which either of them should carry in determining the judgment of the Legislature.

The *Toronto Leader*, in mentioning the fact that a stereotype foundry has just been added to its already extensive and well-appointed establishment, falls into a slight mistake in asserting that "as regards the process employed," *i. e.*, *papier mache*, it is "the only one in the country." A stereotype foundry, by the same process, which is truly, as the *Leader* says, "undeniably the best," was established in Canada in 1862 by Mr. Desbarats, and amongst the many works printed by him from stereotypes made by this process, may be instanced "Festivals' Exchange Tables," published in 1867, which for elegance of typographical execution will challenge comparison with any work ever published in the country. Of course that foundry was destroyed by the fire which reduced Mr. Desbarats' establishment to ashes in the early part of last year; but stereotyping by the same process is now carried on at the office of this journal. The *Leader* would, we believe, have been correct in its assertion had it substituted "Province" for "country."

Having made arrangements with Mr. Notman to take a Photograph and produce a picture representing the approaching Carnival at the Skating Rink, we hope to be able to present our readers, at an early day, with a picture that while interesting in itself, will, we are sure, be produced by Notman with his usual taste and faithfulness. He is now engaged photographing from life those who wish to appear in costume, and all so intending are invited by him to sit for the purpose.

OBITUARY.

JUDGE MALLOCH.

George Malloch, Esq., late County Judge of the United Counties of Leeds and Grenville, died at his residence in Brockville on the night of the 11th inst. During the past twelve months Mr. Malloch suffered considerably from the state of his health, and he was induced thereby to resign his judgeship. Though his health was anything but good, he was still active and passed a good deal of time in transacting private business. On the night of the 10th he retired to bed as usual, and next morning was found dead in his bed, having apparently passed away in his sleep.

The late Judge was a native of Perth, Scotland, and was born on the 13th April 1797. He came to Canada in 1817, and commenced the study of law at Brockville. In 1825 he began to practise, and in 1837 was appointed Judge of the Bathurst district. In 1842 he was nominated to the Judgeship of Leeds and Grenville, which he held till within a few months of his death.

A brief despatch received on Wednesday announced the death at St. Petersburg of Anson Burlingame, the chief of the Chinese mission now on a treaty-making tour to the principal courts of Europe. Mr. Burlingame was formerly U. S. Minister to China, but he threw up that appointment to take charge of and conduct the negotiations of the diplomatic party, in connection with whose labours he has since become so celebrated. In his new capacity, he served the Chinese Government with great zeal and ability, and evinced talents of a very high order. He was a native of Boston, and, before his appearance in public life, carried on business as a dry goods merchant.

PARLIAMENTARY.

OTTAWA, FEB. 21, 1870.

On the return of the House of Commons from the Senate after the delivery of the speech, the following members, new or re-elected, were presented in due form: Messrs. J. L. McDougall, Sir F. Hincks, Christopher Dunkin, Hon. Mr. Morris, and Mr. Seriver. Of the above, Messrs. J. L. McDougall and Mr. Seriver were fresh faces in the House. After the ordinary routine the House adjourned until the following day. The attendance of members was unusually sparse.

On the 16th a question which is likely to produce a tough and animated discussion—the Hon. Mr. McDougall's seat—was