

"Because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved; for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believe not the truth, but have pleasure in unrighteousness."—2 Thess. 2: 10-11. He evidently loves his so called "church" more than the "truth," and hence the judgment upon him and the rest of his brethren. But, "Come out of her," is God's call to those who would be saved, "that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."—Rev. 18: 4.

Mr. Laurier is I believe out on the "Reform" ticket as its professed representative and leader. Well, he might represent a worse thing than "reform," no doubt; but if instead of talking so much about a "reform tariff," which for ought I know to the contrary may need reforming, he would begin at the bottom or foundation of economic government, and talk of a reduction of membership, and of sending say 50 members to parliament where they now send 100, the people might begin to think he meant business. And why, may I ask, might there not be such a reduction? We might, I am sure, be better governed by 50 good representatives than by five times that number who are of a different character. And why, may I ask also, is not one man sufficient to represent a city, whatever its size, and one man for each county, instead of the costly number that now represent them? For the life of me I don't know why not, except on the principle that the country is proud of its costly retinue of servants, as a country squire might be! Begin at the bottom, Sir, reduce membership, cut off "Senatorial" and other hangers-on—all useless offices and employees—give fair salaries while in active service but no retiring allowances; neither the merchant nor the professional man does his clerks, and why should they! All men who are reasonably paid should provide retiring allowances for themselves. Maintain no murderers at the public expense in the penitentiaries, but let them, as justice demands, follow their victims into eternity. Also in many other things and ways economise; and then the country's exchequer will not have to complain of emptiness, nor the people's pockets of the same. For a nation, no less than for an individual citizen, to keep too many servants, tends to bankruptcy.

Having from an economic standpoint referred to the execution of all murderers, I would like here to say further that it seems to me that where the murderer has sanity enough to procure an instrument with the intent to kill, the question of sanity should never be allowed to be professionally raised in court. And were this the case, I think at least 999 murderers out of a thousand would be executed, in accordance with the ordination of Him who never decrees unwisely or unjustly—"He that sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed." Under this law, even if they had no more sanity or sense of moral wrong than an ox, they had to die for it. And I think it should be so still. No man (or woman) that takes the life of another should be permitted himself to live. Nor should they, I think, be retained in life, at the public expense, so long as they usually are. Nor should they be permitted to be fed but with the coarsest "bread of affliction and water of affliction;" as also should all the criminal inmates of our jails. And where the murderer is atrociously criminal, as in the case of Holmes just executed in the States, he should be subjected to a