

also certain that M. Savary has seen with his "own eyes" some peculiar readings of history; query: what is his evidence, as to things present and passing, worth?

A considerable portion of the Press of the Dominion is still exercised over the remarks I made a week or two ago about the relation of ministers and people. They are generally held to be exaggerated and bitter; but I want to say that I spoke truth when I said: "A full exchequer is the basis of our unity, and money is our bond of affection." I do not mean to say that there are not some and noble exceptions, but I should like to have some illustrations of a people poor, in debt and the exchequer failing where there abide "faith, hope and charity." On the other hand, can any one point to a number of churches in financial prosperity, and yet exercised about the question of truth for mind and conduct. Is it not true that as a rule members of a church are happy and contented and in full sympathy with their pastor when money is plentiful, but are apt to find cause of complaint against him the hour money falls short? If ministers could venture to tell us all they know and feel about this matter we should have some tragic stories.

As a matter of fact my remarks were not intended so much for the clergy as for the laity. I am sure that as a class the ministers are men of earnest purpose and self-denial; Christian enthusiasm takes them into the ministry—they intend to hold their souls in manly freedom and declare the message with which heaven may inspire them—but they find by and by that they must provide bread for the family, and independence of speech or action may put that at risk—for the people want us to preach their doxy and not disturb them over much. And they want us to preach it in a way that will fill the pews and draw a good collection. In truth, the minister is allowed some considerable latitude if his wanderings are remunerative. Was I not right then in saying "a full exchequer is the basis of unity"?

The editor of *The Evening Times*, in a critical article on my remarks, while apparently finding fault with the tone of them, is compelled to speak thus:—

"Yet there are far too many instances where the value of a clergyman is rated from the pews by the contributions when the hat is passed and not by his character, humility or ministration. What congregation, nowadays, retains its pastor if debt is not wiped off, buildings enlarged or the membership list increased, or if some material prosperity such as attaches to the speculator's office, the counting house or the auction room is not vouchsafed along with spiritual advancement, which takes second place? Who has not heard of ministers who are more eloquent as contortionists or as specimens of gyrating humanity or as leg-and-arm orators being preferred to the meek and good man whose lips only are eloquent and that in presenting the simple message with which his heart is full. In this nineteenth century a howling dervish would secure more devout attention from the average church-goer than the Prince of Peace himself if He were to pass unrecognized through the midst of the people. Mr. Bray has no doubt made too sweeping an assault, but reflection will bear him out to far too great a degree. When the exceptional minister and the average congregation are taken into consideration, one is too forcibly reminded of the necessity, in so far as concerns the churches—which should be places of meeting for the lowly and contrite of heart—of a complete riddance of the money-changers who have taken possession, even though the means employed be a whip of scorpions."

The judgment given by the judge in the Selkirk petition case, unseating the Hon. D. A. Smith, was based upon hair-splitting with a vengeance. There was not a tittle of proof that Mr. Smith or his agents had directly or indirectly, or in any remote way, been guilty of wrong promises or practices at the election. It is hardly possible that a contest could be carried on more purely; the law of morality and politics was strictly observed—and yet the elected was unseated upon petition. And on this ground: it is declared in the law for elections that no vehicle can be hired on the day of election; one of Mr. Smith's agents engaged a team of horses and a carriage two days before the election and drove off into the country to get two electors to come and cast their vote for his employer. For some reason or other he failed to get the two electors and returned at his leisure. That happens to mean that he returned on the day of the election, and on that account

only Mr. Smith was declared by the judge to have forfeited his seat. If that is not hair-splitting, will some one quote me a case that better illustrates the peculiar process of reasoning called by that name?

Here are the facts and figures about immigration in New York for the month of June:—"About 25,000 emigrants arrived at Castle Garden this week, 1,804 of whom arrived to-day. Arrivals for June foot up 42,026, against 15,330 for June, 1879. During the past six months there has landed at Castle Garden an excessively large number—namely, 177,161, against 65,971 in the corresponding period last year. This year Germany has sent about one-quarter of the emigrants, and they came from other quarters in the following order as to numbers:—Ireland, Scandinavia, England and Scotland, Switzerland, Austria, Russia, and all were of a better class than ever before. The Russians, as a general thing, have been quite destitute, but all other nationalities were provided with more or less money and prepared to start out independently. At least 75 per cent. have gone West.

As against that I should like to be able to give the facts and figures about Canadian Immigration, but I cannot. It would be easy to tell how many immigrants have landed at our ports and been sent over our rails, but not easy to tell how many of them have remained in Canada. Large numbers of them have simply passed through the Dominion into Dakota and other western parts of the United States, and it is a fact that very many have left Manitoba and that district to take up lots across the line. We seem to be making not so much as an effort to compete with the States, and it is commonly reported that our Government Western land regulations are entirely vexatious. If this is so, it is poor policy all round. We ought to make most strenuous efforts to turn the stream of English emigration this way, and to secure the best possible class of them for our own Dominion; and we ought to make settlement here easy and pleasant for them when they come.

The nominations of Garfield and Hancock for the Presidency by the Republicans and the Democrats respectively have given almost unqualified satisfaction to the two great parties in the United States. Garfield, notwithstanding some stupid attempts to fling mud at him over some long past and trivial affair which he evidently deems not worth noticing, is almost an ideal American. He represents the best class of the people—those who have struggled with circumstance and fairly conquered fate. Stage by stage he has worked his way up, always maintaining a manful integrity, and scorning the semblance of meanness. Six weeks ago, Mr. Goldwin Smith, in the *Bystander*—knowing the American people well—spoke of him as being the man of all others best fitted for the post of President, and it is refreshing to hear that they have chosen the best man for their highest office.

General Hancock has lived a good and manful life. Less able than Garfield as a statesman, and it is safe to say, less likely to carry the election, he is none the less a man in whose behalf it will be an honour to lose a political battle. He was a brave soldier during the late war, but he has other qualities which commend him to the people. He is able and honest, and would fill the highest office in the Republic with credit to himself and the people electing him.

The result of the two conventions shows that the great Republic across the lines is no longer ruled by "rings," but by reason. The wire pullers had made most careful calculations; redtape had made the most elaborate preparations for every emergency, and the future was parcelled out into lots; but the people brushed all their plans aside, and without searching much for "the dark horse," brought their best men to the front. Be it Garfield or Hancock a capable man will reside at the White House. Poor Grant must be sadly disappointed. So sure was he of the nomination and the election that when in Mexico he invited some parties who met him there to visit him at the White House. He promised to give them some good times, and they are terribly put about by the turn of affairs in Chicago.

As might have been expected the British Government has been compelled to change its attitude with regard to Bradlaugh, and admit him to take the seal for which he was elected. But let no mistaken