

assume the charge of the Alexander Street Church. He is a good type of the Evangelical preacher,—calm, thoughtful, earnest and devout. While he can scarcely be said, as an orator, to have fulfilled the promise of the earlier years of his ministry, yet he is well adapted to attract a certain order of minds, and to hold all he attracts. But he is perhaps too quiet, modest and retiring ever to become very popular: although he may be eminently useful within the lines of his denomination. And here it may be said that these lines are somewhat closely drawn in Montreal (perhaps elsewhere also). There are three Baptist churches,—the one just named, another whose pastor is a young man lately from Ontario, and one in the west of the city which is ministered unto by the Rev. John Gordon. These churches form a little circle which holds itself in close non-communication with the other Protestant churches of the city. Indeed one of the three ministers is credited with the saying that "We are the only evangelical ministers in Montreal!" Mr. Gordon himself is a Scotchman who comes filtered through an American medium, having been for some time a pastor in Chicago. People complain that he can never forget this, and say that he has "Chicago on the brain." Certainly there is very little of the Scotchman left. He is a man of good presence: a fair preacher; mildly poetic; somewhat minute, not to say microscopic, in his exegesis of the Scriptures; and distressingly orthodox; especially in regard to immersion and close-communication.

But to return. Facing the First Baptist Church is the only Unitarian Church in Montreal. Dr. Greene is the minister,—a man of considerable power as a thinker, writer and speaker. He has a good and somewhat wealthy congregation; amongst whom may be found some of the "most advanced thinkers" of the city. All who can be satisfied with the molluscous and negative theology of Unitarianism will find it forcibly and attractively presented by Dr. Greene. Here, however, as elsewhere, it is not found to possess the vital energy of a positive system of religion, and cannot be said to be making much headway.

(To be continued.)

### "WORKING WOMEN."

That there is a general change in all ideas concerning women, is a fact admitted on all sides. Two articles, lately in the CANADIAN SPECTATOR, bring women prominently forward—one "A la Mode," regarding them almost specially after a fashion—the other, in "Heretical Opinions," trying from a more interior view of the difference of sex, to place them on a footing of equal power with men. Then a few weeks back we have the "Women's Disabilities Bill" brought up in the Parliament of Great Britain—thrown out again, but with an addition to its former strength of twelve votes, and with a certainty that, sooner or later, it will gain the victory. And if we want another sign of the times we have "The Matrimonial Causes Act," which has just come into operation in England. Women have now, practically, their rights in their own hands. But the first necessity is to free themselves from the tyranny—not of men—but of each other and themselves. They voluntarily remain bound when they ought to be free, fettered by the great law of Mrs. Grundy, which they themselves have bound around themselves, and do all in their power to bind on their fellow-women. For instance, they not only tolerate sins in a man, but too often flatter and court him notwithstanding, whereas the same sins in a woman would make her suspected and deemed unfit for the position of a servant in the house. These things ought not so to be, and till women more thoroughly respect themselves and each other, and demand equal purity of life in men and women, men will cherish a secret contempt for them and are quite entitled to do so. There is no necessity for this being the case. Women—the queens and leaders of society—have allowed a warped idea of morality to creep in, of which men were swift to take advantage, and now, women must alter this because it is unjust, and a wrong to men as well as to themselves. Then again, the law for all men is *work*, and we blame a man who is idle and will not do something, even if he has enough means. But fortunately, no man worthy of the name, prefers an easy, idle life. Why then should not the same law hold good for women—"work?" It does, in many cases, and hard work, too, but these are women—not ladies—and then comes in a class distinction which for the good and usefulness of all, ought not to be.

All, from the poorest to the richest, ought to have work that depends on them to do and is necessary and must be done thoroughly. Imagine a young man of our Dominion just taking it easy and loafing away his life or filling in his days with as much pleasure as possible till, sooner or later, he marries some one! Why should it be so with any woman in any position? The actual joy of being practically useful, which is the greatest joy in life, is cut off from these women by the fiat of society, lest she lose her position, &c., and so she keeps waiting and fretting and filling her time with anything, just for something to do, till, perhaps in desperation she marries to get out of such a false position and have something of her own. Now, why should there be no course open to her but this? Occupation in some work of the world would be her salvation from much misery and a satisfaction far above studying fashions and planning gaieties and wearying of them all. Besides, the time for these must pass, and many a woman who in the midst of much frivolity is true to her own ideal of man, will not have dared to rush into matrimony for a passing sensation or as a relief from *ennui*. What comes then? Life left undeveloped by calls of necessity on heart and hands is very sure to become cramped and even soured; unoccupied and so unsatisfied. Will it never be that each woman, as each man, will be expected to be able to support herself, and be trained to do so in manufacture, commerce or profession? I can see no disgrace in this. Idleness is the curse of many a life, and brings countless imaginary ills in its train. To be doctors seems at present the highest point aimed at by many women, and it is a good one, no doubt. But if useful occupation was general, and if young women were made acquainted with the physical laws of their being, and all were enlightened as to the true nature of marriage, there would be less need of doctors of any kind, and sound health, moral and physical, would in great part be restored to the world. There seems a prevailing horror of actual labour—toiling with the hands—even among men; the spirit of the age is to

rise above (?) work and to make brains do instead. Now when we use brains alone, we are apt to overlook the heart and become overbearing and unjust, and without hard work we do not possess the wisdom which comes of actual experience. All three, head—heart and hands—should be called into exercise by each man and woman in their own life, as necessary to help them in the onward march to perfection. But when we make money the standard, instead of character, then brains alone—and strong ones too—are perhaps the most essential for our purpose. To me, definite occupation seems a necessity for all, and as all women may not prefer the opportunity of guiding a household and bringing up children, let them not be considered singular if they set aside Mrs. Grundy's opinion. Some mothers prefer their daughters to be unable to do anything thoroughly, because it is ladylike; and when such is the case, who can wonder at so much discontent, misery and poverty which invade so many homes after a few years of wedded life are past? What sensible man would not prefer, as wife, a woman who could actually do something to earn her own bread should sickness lay him aside or misfortune fall on his business, or death remove him from providing for her? All can't make money. To thousands it must ever be "day by day our daily bread," and being content with that for daily work. The strain of the world would ease, and more leisure be given to the study of science, the development of art, and the practice in all things of true

"WISDOM."

### THE ANTIDOTE.

There does come a time occasionally in the history of individuals and nations when sarcasm is thrown away upon them. Something stronger is needed. Men become so utterly blinded by self-will and passion that sarcastic remarks and comic eloquence are either taken for covert praise or resented as an insult. Affairs in the Province of Quebec have reached that stage. It behoves those of us who have opinions to speak plainly, with no small degree of emphasis. Practical measures are what are wanted. If we cannot have these at once, let us at least try to direct public attention towards a practical end, in which, when attained, the cure for present evils is certain to be found.

In existing circumstances there is one direction in which effort is certain to be fruitful in annihilating anarchy and class rule. Difficult of attainment it may be, but we must aim for it. It is this—the centralization of Government. This course, begun for us by Sir John A. Macdonald when Confederation of the Provinces was effected, must be continued and carried to completion. Whether its originator is the man to do this or not is a side issue, which will shortly decide itself. Certain it is to every rational mind that a country with four Parliaments and Senates as the base of its pyramid of power, with a fifth Parliament and Senate towering upwards as its apex, may seem a very solid structure calculated to strike the beholder with awe, yet it is really cumbersome to a degree, and useless now for all practical purposes as the Pyramids themselves. The genius of a new country like this is utility—not grandeur. This pyramidal form of power lacks, too, one element of strength very apparent in the structure referred to. Its various parts do not cohere. The base is restless—the law of gravity—and the weight of wisdom—frequently suffer entire suspension in these Provincial Parliaments, and the result is a tottering of the apex and a tendency to plunge into Egyptian darkness—a darkness which is felt, deeply felt, by the nation.

Permit me to drop the sublime and condescend to the practical. The root from which these remarks derive their life is the Provincial Parliament of Quebec. Recently convicted of unholy jobbery, they are now, under new and certainly much improved auspices, driving their heads against the solid buttress of our national liberties in the passing of the "Party Processions Act." It is a melancholy symptom of an unhealthy decline of vigorous life when a Government feels impelled to suppress processions instead of applying its energies to suppressing the suppressors. Printer's errors will creep in, and it might chance appropriately enough to be spelt *oppressors*. The cure for the evil is simply this—one central Dominion Parliament, an apex deprived of any base but the common sense of the majority of the qualified voters in the nation. Let Provincial Governments go by the board. They have bored us long enough with speeches light as air, and largely filled with that ingredient. But that is not the worst. Custom renders that enduring, and flight is always possible. But attempts at government—or rather misgovernment—utterly contrary to the spirit and practice of all law in every land where the British flag bears rule, are altogether too much. The knell of the Quebec Government, at least, has been voluntarily rung by itself, and from that cheerful sound we hear the echo reverberating in the hearts of true and trusty men in Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Merely an empty echo it cannot long remain.

Such is the practical aim—the practical cure. Is it unconstitutional? Then the constitution can be amended, and it must. That four millions of people should require four Parliaments and Senates, besides a fifth of higher rank and quality to steady the others, is on the face of it absurd. One Parliament and a quarter to each million of men, women and children! Verily this country should be well gov'tned! But is it? Let Mayor Beaudry answer. Expense, in a new country like this, is, of course, no object. Still, there is some cost involved in the happy possession of eleven hund—, but there, we will not indulge in figures, lest we make ourselves obnoxious—although figures, like the main point of this argument, do not lie.

The practical utility of such narrowing of governmental power into one centre, and one only, is so apparent that it only needs to be mentioned. One thing at least we would gain by it. It is this. If anarchy and mob law are so prevalent amongst us as to command the general support of the vast majority of our people, finding voice through one central parliament, we would have the satisfaction of feeling that such a state of things was eminently congenial to the great heart of the nation, and those few of us who still felt the retention of some manhood needful, as well as the retention of our life, would know exactly where we stood in relation to our fellows and prepare ourselves to leave, nor hinder longer the development of this country's destiny.

Law does not seem particularly binding, at least in this Province, nor is its interpretation in any required direction a matter of any great difficulty. A few