

Our old friend Mr. Smiles is out with another book. It is called "Duty," and was published in England at the same time with "Endymion." It is likely to do the people of England far more good than the stilted stuff which Beaconsfield gave them. This is not the best work Mr. Smiles has done—there is an air of "book-making" about it, but none the less it contains some sound advice for daily life and work, and those who need a stimulus to "duty" should read it. This also is from Harper, New York. (Dawson Brothers, Montreal.)

The removal of the kiosk has not as yet been effected, notwithstanding the severe protests of indignant citizens. The chief objection to it is its position, which is too public. The statement that kiosks are in as public positions in New York and other American cities is true in a sense, but the circumstances are not analogous. In New York they are chiefly to be found in what is called "down-town"—in City Hall Square—but then this being the business portion of the city, is but little frequented by ladies. In Victoria Square, the contrary is the case, and the placing of the kiosk is an insult to decency and good taste. If the Alderman will not get it removed the citizens should find some way of doing it themselves.

There is a custom in Montreal which is rather amusing, and somewhat interesting. I refer to the continued driving up and down St. James and Notre Dame streets. It certainly gives a lively appearance to the streets, but what amusement or pleasure there is in it to the occupants of the sleighs must consist in the desire to see and be seen. The fashion is to have large sleighs with elevated seats for the coachmen—while the ladies are cosily esconced in rich furs—and the horses are usually out of all proportion, being too small for the sleigh, making it appear as if the sleigh was impelling the horses.

Efforts have been, and are being made, to establish a Co-operative Society in Montreal. Quite a number of shares have been taken up, though it is doubtful whether the promoters will succeed in raising the large capital proposed. These societies have in many cases, if not all, proved somewhat successful in England, in spite of the violent opposition of shop-keepers. The reason of their success is difficult to discover, as it is hard to understand why the ordinary shop-keeper cannot sell as cheaply as the organized company. The company can purchase in very large quantities, and this is, perhaps, the only advantage, but then there must be many retailers who are possessed of large capital; this being the case, experience has shown that, other circumstances being equal, the individual can compete with advantage and profit against the company. Large bodies move slowly.

We are deluged at present with Sunday-school festivals, entertainments, bazaars, lectures and amusements of all kinds, and probably many will be surfeited—but this is holiday time, and let all enjoy it. *Dulce est desipere in loco.*

A correspondent writes me that he is often advised that, being a young man with a small income the best thing he can do is to get married. He states that he has been lately "a Cœlebs in search of a wife" but with no success. He has found many young ladies whose time was almost entirely taken up in flirtations, and who only seemed to care to find partners who could dance well—"merely this and nothing more," and he found some who would permit the attentions of gentlemen until they were the talk of everybody. This correspondent did not care to select a wife from these nor from the dogmatic self-assertive class who know everything and have an opinion on every subject. He says he is looking for one whose manners are maidenly and whose conversation is agreeable; he does not want a musician, but one of fair education and good common sense. In fact, he wants one of good *physique* and sound *morale*, and if he should be successful he will have one who is a "fortune" in herself. The difficulty is in the capability of persons now-a-days to live on small incomes—the tendency is to extravagance and waste; there is no respect paid to habits of economy for fear of being thought penurious, and the result is that but few marriages take place. The question of

marriage on small incomes is important and worthy of discussion, and I submit it to the readers of the SPECTATOR who may be interested in the matter.

This question as to whether young men with small incomes should enter the matrimonial state is a much vexed one. Many are the excuses offered by young men—the income is too small, wives are too expensive and so are household expenses—but frequently there are many personal and necessary luxuries that the young man might curtail or dispense with entirely. The blame is too often thrown upon the opposite sex and most unjustly—the expensive tastes generally are favoured by the young man. It is a platitude that young women are devoted to dress and fashion—this is a stock argument, similar to that of the charge of immorality against actors and actresses who are no better nor worse than those of many other professions.

Toronto can hardly boast itself on the liberality and general generosity of the ecclesiastical portion of the community. Even in Montreal the anti-organ sentiment is represented by a very few Presbyterians who give no signs of increasing in number and influence; but in Toronto a large and important church has got into a most unseemly squabble over a harmonium which was placed in the basement of the church to help the choir in their practices. The trouble is being settled in a law court. What a spectacle for the young men who are beginning to sneer at all churches? What a deadly influence it must have upon the individual members of the church and others? What a travesty of the teachings of Him who said "Love one another."

Here is another illustration of Torontonian ecclesiasticism. Bishop Sweatman has announced that he intends having a series of meetings in January for the discussion of subjects of importance to the Church. And the sixth item on the programme reads thus: "The attitude of the Church in this country toward the denominations.—Ven. Archdeacon Whitaker." Had the subject been less serious, we might laugh at the absurd pretensions of the thing. We might conclude that the Archdeacon is at any rate old—very old—even antiquated, but not venerable. But the Bishop adopts it, and commits all the Toronto Episcopalians, meantime, to the blatant, discourteous and unchristian snobbery. Even the clergy of the Church of England never talk in that way. "The Church and the denominations" forsooth? And this is the way we are to meet Ingersollism? Heaven help the Ven. Archdeacon to a little common-sense and Christian manliness in time for him to withdraw the absurd item from the programme.

Canadians will learn with pleasure that the story which went the rounds of the press in England and Canada, that there was a serious difference of opinion between the Queen and Princess Louise is not correct. It has been flatly contradicted by those who seem to speak with authority. They say that the Queen gave her consent for the Princess to leave Canada, and that the Doctors have forbidden her return until the severe part of the winter is passed. The regrettable accident was not an unmixed evil since it has compelled the Princess to spend the winter in England instead of at Ottawa. The "Court" at Ottawa may be all very well, but the courtiers?

The manifesto of the Liberal party against the terms of the Government contract with the Syndicate was dull and insipid even to a sin. There was not a well turned phrase or sentence in it; the literary style was simply execrable, and there was not a point which is calculated to rouse popular enthusiasm. Mr. Blake should have written the manifesto himself or have got a competent person to do it.

It must be confessed that the tone of public opinion is somewhat altered since the terms of the C. P. R. contract were laid before the House. Of course the *Globe* was fierce against it, and Mr. Blake had to prepare a speech to lead off the Opposition. That the Conservatives would in the main support it, and the Liberals oppose it, was a foregone conclusion. One or two of the Liberal papers held off for a little—notably the *Montreal Herald*—but it was soon drummed into line, and now gives neither feeble nor uncertain sound against the