

and if they had put in an advertisement or two it would be easy to prove that public money has often been worse spent. Does Mr. Mackenzie imagine that the Canadian Government can keep the outside world from hearing of the United States?

Undoubtedly Government should do something to keep Canada together. As it now stands very many of the best of our young and enterprising men are crossing the lines every year to settle in the United States. One of our leading lawyers said to me a few days ago: "If I were thirty years of age, and had only ten dollars in my pocket, I would leave for the States." Nothing can build us up but a vigorous promotion of immigration. We ought in some way to get hold of the small farmers, of whom there are thousands in England, Ireland and Scotland who have money enough to start well upon here. But what is wanted is, first of all, reliable information conveyed by some responsible persons, and then, as I have often said, the farmer must know that he has a house to eat and sleep in when he comes here. England is cultivated like a garden—such a thing as clearing ground is scarcely known, and the idea of going out and living in a tent until a house can be built, and then clearing the land yard by yard is what Hodge cannot comprehend. Give Hodge a house, and a cow, and a pig, and a bit of cleared ground to begin with and he will come, and work hard, and grow corn and cattle, and buy tools and food, and so increase the manufacture and commerce of the country. Government, or private companies, will have to do something in this practical way if immigration is to be increased.

There is a change in the times, and for the better. Even the *Globe* confesses so much. It says: "In Canada we have abundant cause for thankfulness," and goes on to show that prosperity has surmounted every artificial barrier erected against it, and is overflowing us. But how can that be harmonized with the general run of *Globular* teachings? As I have understood them the country has been ruined by the National Policy—almost every industry has been crippled, and many of them have been closed altogether. The members of the Opposition in Parliament are doing their best to discourage Canadians and promote emigration to the United States. What reasonable being would care to come to Canada as painted by Mr. Mackenzie and Sir Richard Cartwright and the *Globe*? It must appear to any who in Great Britain have the misfortune to see the *Globe*, as if it is a country in which a man can die rapidly of starvation by the help of legislation. What is gained by all this? Certainly nothing for the followers of Mr. Brown. If it could be proved to-morrow that the N. P. is a failure and a mistake, there would be no demand for a change of Government, for Sir John would get credit for having made an effort to bring about a better state of things; and a man moving, if only to make experiments, is a goodlier sight in the eyes of the people than a dazed "fly on the wheel." We adopted the N. P., and then came better times, and in the ordinary mind the two things are and will remain connected, and Mr. Mackenzie and the *Globe* cannot argue nor abuse them into mutual hostility.

It is to be hoped that our representatives at Ottawa are not going to allow the clergy of the Dominion to decide the question as to whether the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill shall pass the House or not. Their connection with Leviticus must be very remote, if they have any at all. I am disposed to pay all possible respect to Moses and his legislation; but if we are to take all his laws and enactments, let us say so and do it, and drive the shadow on the dial back as far as we can; or if we are going to discriminate, let us do it reasonably. If we are to pick this one Jewish statute out for observance, we ought to do it because it answers some good purpose in our own times. I can see many reasons for allowing a man to marry his deceased wife's sister—if they both desire such a thing; but I can find no intelligent grounds in Biblical law or gospel for making it illegal. This is in no way a question for the clergy, and they ought not to be consulted about the matter.

Ah me, and alas! here is another ground for complaint against our mother-country and another reminder from over the waters that

we are a great way off and have no right to expect to reap further benefits from old English customs. It has been understood that the birth of triplets was worthy of royal recognition in the shape of five pounds sterling from the Queen to the fortunate mother of said three. With a full knowledge of this good custom, the wife of Joseph Spencer, of Burleigh, presented him with triplets, and with a heart three times full of gladness he wrote an application for the Queen's bounty. But, poor man, he got the following reply instead of a cheque:—

OTTAWA, March 16.

I am directed to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 12th inst., and its enclosure, applying on behalf of Mrs. Spencer for the Queen's bounty in consideration of her having given birth to triplets. In reply I am to inform you that a communication has been received at this Department from the proper authorities in England, to the effect that these cases occurring in the colonies do not come within the Queen's rule on the subject, which is to give a small donation to poor people of good character on occasions of triple births where the children survive, the money being given to assist the parents in providing food and clothing shortly after the birth of the children. It is added that the length of time which must elapse before a triple birth in the colonies can be reported to the proper quarter makes it next to impossible to admit the case as coming within the rule laid down, and that the money when given is by no means a reward, but simply as an act of charity.

I have the honour to be, etc.,

Edward J. Langevin,

Under Secretary of State.

Now, it is of course true that the "proper authorities in England" have decided not to encourage this sort of thing in the Colonies, and have instructed the Governor-General to put an end to this drain upon the royal exchequer, but Mrs. Spencer should have her five pounds none the less. Government could very well add this to its N. P. and give the money, as M. Langevin delicately puts it, "by no means as a reward, but simply as an act of charity."

The English Parliament is dissolved and the electoral campaign fever is at its highest. When the announcement was made that the Earl of Beaconsfield had at last made up his mind to go to the country with an appeal for judgment upon his policy and practice for the last six years, it appeared as if he had chosen the right time. The Liberals had been coquetting with the Irish Home Rulers, which gave the Conservatives a chance of lumping Home Rulers and Liberals together as Obstructionists. But the game was a poor one, and lasted only a few days. Whatever some members of the party, anxious to secure a seat in the House, and willing to pay any price in the way of promises, may do or say, the Liberal leaders are not likely to show any favour to Mr. Parnell and his political allies. So the prospects of Mr. Gladstone's followers are brightening every day. One of the best proofs we could have of that is the altered tone of the *Times*. It does not agree with the great William yet, but it pays him most marked and respectful attention, criticising mildly and condemning feebly. The *Daily Telegraph* may be expected to follow suit.

One source of weakness to the Liberal party is the want of a personal head. Lord Hartington is not capable of creating any enthusiasm about himself. When he was elected to fill the place Mr. Gladstone had vacated, it was rather on account of what he had not than for any positive qualities. Mr. Forster had made himself obnoxious to the Nonconformists, by supporting the twenty-fifth clause of the Education Act; Mr. Lowe was powerful, but personally unpopular; Mr. Bright was out of the question; Earl Granville was in the House of Lords, and Lord Hartington appeared the only man competent to hold the party together, because he had done nothing and said nothing to offend any section of it. And it must be confessed that he has succeeded fairly well in a most trying position. A stronger man would have rebelled against being merely the nominal head, and knowing that the old leader had only to utter the word and every Liberal would return to his allegiance; but Lord Hartington is not a strong man, hardly an ambitious man, and therefore has been well content with the honour of his position.

But it is evident that if the Liberals are going to carry on the electoral contest with any hope of winning they must have a powerful