

would leave them a free and independent State, having the complete control of their own affairs, and a better cow to milk than the one we pasture at Ottawa. It is not probable that the church authorities favour this; they are anxious for matters to remain as they are, but if there must be a change even they would favour annexation rather than legislative union. And this incessant plunging deeper and deeper into debt,—building railroads for the sake of providing places for political friends; building new parliament houses when they are not required and the exchequer is beggared,—is making some sort of change a dire necessity which will come upon us before long. Three courses are open to us: better and cheaper government: the abolition of provincial distinctions, and government by one central parliament, that is to say, Legislative Union; or, Annexation to the United States. Of better and cheaper government there is no sign; the majority in Quebec, would furiously oppose Legislative Union; what is left?

It is quite conceivable that, if change there must be, the people of Ontario would think many times and long before they again consented to link their fortunes once more with Quebec. They tried it before and found it so unworkable that they had to devise the clumsy scheme of Federation in order to get along with a show of peace and a chance of prosperity. Ontario wants no change, but what if change be forced upon her? If, of two evils, she has to choose the least, which will she deem the least? I am not advocating Annexation, nor do I wish to be accused of doing so; I am only trying to point to the necessary end of the courses we are pursuing. It seems to me that Quebec is manipulating the destiny of the Dominion by its government in the interest of party, and will force upon us changes of a radical nature, in spite of ourselves. Legislative Union would meet the case and remedy the evil. It would consolidate what is now scattered, and fuse the disintegrated. A nationality might suffer; a church might undergo a weakening process, but the whole would net a clear gain, and the future be less uncertain. Therefore, I advocate Legislative Union. Let us wipe out these Provincial Parliaments, which are a delusion and a snare.

Captain Norris writes to me from Kingston to say that Canadians have taken, and do take more interest in the future of the Dominion than I have been led to suppose, and in confirmation of his statement calls attention to a pamphlet published by him in 1875 on "The Canadian Question." It is an able, although not very readable treatise, and contains some very peculiar deductions as to the basis, or value, of general history; for example, we are told that "impartial history is an impossibility so long as religious belief is in its present position. History at present is but the abuse of the rival sects." That is a poor start, it must be admitted, and if the writer had committed himself to less generalising and moralising, he would have made his point more clearly; but he shows a very considerable acquaintance with Canadian affairs, and finishes with the expression of a very decided opinion for Independence:—

"On the whole the prospect is that Canada could sustain independence. She is doing so in reality at present. In all things affecting the country itself, Canada governs itself. The only thing to complete her sovereignty is power to transact her business and intercourse with foreign powers. All the expense necessary to self-government is sustained by Canada with the exception of the expense of a diplomatic body, and that would not cost much. Representation at the capitals of the Great Powers would only be necessary. An ambassador at Washington, London, Paris, Vienna and St. Petersburg could be supported for \$50,000 a year, and we pay that sum now to a Governor-General. The labour and trouble which would be saved to Canadian merchants by having a man in Washington alone, through whom Canadian business could be done directly with the American Government, would pay for the extra expense. If then so little extra expense is required and such great benefits are to be obtained, is not independence to be desired. That independence if obtained would be prized above all earthly considerations by Canadians, and it would only be lost when there would not be left five thousand men in the country to fight for it. The new state might not be at first very formidable—so much the better for its success; it would not attract the envy or rivalry of any other nation."

Shades of Quorn and Pytchley! I wonder if the M. F. H. have managed to secure another "bagged" fox. I am also surmising

whether it is true that dogs are still kept at the kennels by members at the expense of the Hunt, and whether it is still an easy matter for a member to save expense by using one of the Hunt horses. Is it true that a red-herring trail has furnished good sport, but no fox?

In the local news column of the Montreal *Herald*, issue May 25th, I find the following sentence:—"On Saturday afternoon, a constable seeing a dog, which was as many people call mad, he took the opportunity to shoot it." I wonder who "built" that sentence.

I think that the quiet condition of the Montreal wharves at present gives a very convincing contradiction to the exaggerated reports, published anent the labourers' strikes, by certain papers here. This sensational style of reporting may be very good reading for a certain class, but it tends to injure, commercially, the reputation of our harbour.

Will somebody explain to me how it is that a farmer who does not succeed in Lower Canada, with the advantages of cheap land, close proximity to a good market and saving of freight, expects to succeed away up in Manitoba, when he surely will have to pay the freight to the shipping port on his produce, and most probably will, before many years, find the market glutted with wheat? At present a local demand is doing some good, but this is only temporary.

I am strongly of the opinion that a farmer, or young man, who would devote the same energy and apply himself as earnestly in Quebec or Ontario as he is obliged to do in Manitoba, would certainly be rewarded with as large a return.

SIR,—It is devoutly to be hoped you are mistaken in saying "There are Episcopal clergymen in Canada who would refuse Canon Farrar the use of their pulpit, and who advise their audiences against reading his 'Life of Christ' and Dickens's novels." I have heard of *one*, and but one, popular preacher (so called) who advised his people neither to read Farrar's "*Eternal Hope*" nor Dickens's works. Surely there is not *another* to be found who would give similar utterances.

Nevertheless, the sentiments and writings of Canon Farrar will, I doubt not, cheer and animate the hearts of God's faithful people when the name of his detractor has passed from memory. With such men as Farrar, "*opinion* is truly the focus of thought," whilst with others it is simply the outcome of ignorance and all uncharitableness. A careful study of the 15th Psalm might perhaps prove beneficial.

Yours truly,

E. L.

I could name twenty clergymen who would not admit Canon Farrar into their pulpit. What does "E. L." think of that act by which a clergyman was turned out of his pulpit because he had taken communion with his mother in a Presbyterian Church? Bishop Sweatman refused to speak in a non-Episcopal Church.

I notice the report of the meeting of the Montreal Society of Decorative Art, held on the afternoon of the 26th. In view of the fact that this Society has been established for the purpose of aiding a class to help themselves: a class that it is extremely difficult to reach in any other manner than that in which this Society is ably conducted,—in view of these facts, I note with pleasure its favourable report, and wish it a hearty God-speed in its work.

A man must have a peculiar taste, and a lamentable lack of that blessed ability of self-abasement, who can assiduously seek after and reproduce statements favourable to himself. I have known preachers who had a habit of reading from pulpit or platform any friendly epistle which a friend had sent. I have known men to ask their admirers to send them letters of praise that their words of commendation might be read in public. Some newspapers have the same weakness. If another paper utter a word of favourable criticism or comment upon them, it is, at once reproduced and flaunted and flamed about in a