

sick man, long bedridden, is relieved by turning over upon one sore side, with a view to easing the other. In spite of argument and remonstrance, the Farmers' Sons Franchise Bill was pressed to a third reading and passed—a statutory monument to legislative fatuousness. It is needless to mention names, for we dislike the pillory of black-lettering, yet there certainly were found some names upon the division-list, in favour of invidious class legislation, one did not except to read there. Of course, the plea was that the bill is popular in the counties, of which there is not the slightest evidence. Yet it can be made effective, no doubt, at the hustings, and farmer's sons will, of course, be in honour bound to vote for men who have singled them out from the entire population, as the only relatives of the farmer and the only class of the community untaxed who are thought worthy of being gifted with the franchise. What other *young men will say, who are left out in the cold*, it is difficult to guess; the consolation of the politician is that they have no votes, without reflecting that, a few years hence, they may possess them. But, with most politicians, the eminently Christian aphorism, 'Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof' has been interpreted by a gloss from the Talmud of the Philistines, and serves alike for present comfort and future hope.

The defeat of the Orange Bill was perhaps a foregone conclusion, yet it was the most imprudent of the unwise acts for which the Ontario Government is responsible. To Mr. Fraser belongs such praise as is due to the efforts of a good disciplinarian; he had 'marshalled his clan' and instructed them in the manual and platoon exercise, until, when the hour of trial came, they presented a serried front to the foe. Mr. Bethune and three other supporters of the Government, were the only ones who went over to the hostile camp. To drop the metaphor, Mr. Mowat appeared in a new rôle, as the champion of crass prejudices and the vindicator of subservience to the League. Some curiosity had been felt as to the course the Premier would decide to take on this occasion, but all doubt was speedily set at rest, when he 'took the floor.' His address was exceedingly good both in form and delivery; he spoke with

unwonted animation and point, yet we hardly think he convinced a single hearer. There was evidently an *arrière pensée*, such as tender consciences unwittingly betray, when they are making out a case for a course to which they can give but a half-hearted assent. There were, after all, but three points in the Premier's speech worthy of special remark; the first was a bold defiance to the Orange body, coupled with the taunt that he had out-flanked them by skilful manœuvring; the second, an appeal to the fears of honourable members; the third, an appeal, *ad misericordiam*, for tender consideration to the prejudices of our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens. Mr. Mowat stated that he had, on a former occasion, supported a similar measure to that then before the House, in opposition to all his colleagues. The course of the Government on that occasion has not been forgotten. A great deal of rubbish has been spoken about 'embarrassing' ministers by the introduction of this bill; but for what purpose was the former bill reserved, after its passage, if it were not to 'embarrass' Sir John Macdonald and his colleagues? As might have been foreseen the then Premier of the Dominion refused to be entrapped by so transparent a device, and the bill was returned upon Mr. Mowat's hands not assented to, but yet unvetoes. 'In vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird'—especially a bird so wary and experienced as the right honourable gentleman. In his speech on the 7th ultimo, Mr. Mowat boldly avowed that to get rid of the awkward question which the Government had not the courage to face, he introduced a general Bill to meet the particular case—the most indefensible species of legislation perhaps that could be imagined, unless it be an *ex post facto* law. Now, it is unnecessary to go into the objections of Orangemen to the General Act of 1874, as being unsuitable for the purpose and unreasonably expensive. The Premier holds one opinion upon this subject, whilst the members of the society hold the opposite; but on the whole, we are inclined to think that the latter know better what they want, and are more likely to be well informed as to the cost, having had occasion to count it. Moreover, Mr. Meredith's objection that any County Judge might refuse the incorporation of all the lodges within his juris-