

THINGS IN GENERAL.

"MANY MICKLES MAKE A MUCKLE."

According to the calculation of Mr. G. T. C. Bartley, an ounce of bread wasted daily in each household in England and Wales is equal to 25,000,000 quartern loaves, the produce of 30,000 acres of wheat, and enough to feast annually 100,000 people. An ounce of meat wasted is equal to 300,000 sheep.

ONLY TEMPER.

Touchwood is that kind of good fellow. He is by turns insolent, quarrelsome, repulsively haughty to innocent people who approach him with respect, neglectful of his friends, angry in face of legitimate demands, procrastinating in the fulfilment of such demands, prompted to rude words and harsh looks by a moody disgust with his fellow-men in general—and yet, as everybody will assure you, the soul of honour, a steadfast friend, a defender of the oppressed, an affectionate-hearted creature. Pity that, after a certain experience of his moods, his intimacy becomes insupportable! A man who uses his balmorals to tread on your toes with much frequency and an unmistakable emphasis may prove a fast friend in adversity, but meanwhile your adversity has not arrived, and your toes are tender. The daily sneer or growl at your remarks is not to be made amends for by a possible eulogy or defense of your understanding against depreciators who may not present themselves, and on an occasion which may never arise. I cannot submit to a chronic state of blue-and-green bruise as a form of insurance against an accident.—*Theophrastus Such*, by George Eliot.

RELIGIONS IN THE UNITED STATES.

The exclusiveness of public opinion against some of the prevailing forms of religious belief in America, till within 20 or 30 years ago, was at least equal to anything found among ourselves. A well-known English traveller passing through the States where Unitarian opinions were not in vogue, tells us that she was warned in significant terms that she had better conceal them if she wished to find social reception. The passion for pilgrimages, relics, and anniversaries is, with some obvious modifications, as ardent as in the European Churches of the Middle Ages, and the preternatural multiplication of the wood of the Mayflower is said to be almost as extraordinary as the preternatural multiplication of the wood of the True Cross. Again, the social estimation of the different Churches bears a striking resemblance to those distinctions which in other forms might have been found in the Churches of Europe centuries ago. These relations are in detail often the reverse of what we find in Europe, but this does not make less significant the general fact of the combination of certain religious convictions with certain strata of society. Let me briefly give a sketch of these social conditions as they now appear, inherited, no doubt, in large proportion from the historical origin of the different creeds. At the top of the scale must be placed, varying according to the different States in which they are found, the Unitarian Church, chiefly in Massachusetts; the Episcopal Church, chiefly in Connecticut and the Southern States. Next, the Quakers, or Friends, in Philadelphia, limited in numbers, but powerful in influence and respectability, who constituted the mainstay of Pennsylvania loyalty during the war of Independence. Next, the Presbyterian Church, and close upon its borders and often on a level with it, the Congregationalists. Then, after a long interval, the Methodists; and following upon them, also after an interval, the Baptists; and again, with perhaps a short interval, the Universalists, springing from the lower ranks of Congregationalists. Then, after a deep gulf, the Roman Catholic Church, which, except in Maryland and the French population of Canada and of Old Louisiana, is confined almost entirely to the Irish. Their political influence is no doubt powerful; but this arises from the homogeneity of their vote. There are also a few distinguished examples of Roman Catholics in the highest ranks of the legal profession. Below and besides all these are the various unions of eccentric characters, Shakers, and the like, who occupy in the retired fastnesses of North America something of the same position which was occupied by the like eccentric monastic orders of mediæval Europe.—*Dean Stanley, in Macmillan's Magazine*.

BRITISH EMPIRE IN INDIA.

Nature has defined the greatness, the unity, and the limits of this giant Empire by the Himalaya range on the north, the sea on the east, south, and west. It embraces a fifth part of the entire human race; its mistress is throned on an island thousands of miles away, and this nation of 240,000,000 is ruled by a handful of some 30,000 strangers, whose native land was still marsh and forest, and their forefathers clothed in the skins of wild animals, when India already possessed an uncommonly rich and highly elaborated language, great epic poems, philosophical systems, and a social order based on religion. And their foreign rulers are divided from their subjects by everything which elsewhere associates and binds men together, by race, colour, religion, language, manners, and customs; they do not come with the intention of settling and taking root in the country, but rather with the view of leaving it again after their work is done, and have, therefore, neither the desire nor the expectation of ever becoming fused in one social community with the natives. We look in

vain for any similar phenomenon, either in the past or in the present. The Roman Empire in its best days did not include half the existing population of India; it was for a long period a mere barren military domination; the majority of its Emperors lie under the ban of history, and it passed through growing impoverishment and depopulation to its inglorious fall, while—apart from extraordinary calamities—the population of British India increases—if the statements published by Anglo-Indian authorities may be relied upon—by 24,000,000 every year. [There must obviously, as the author himself suspected, be some mistake here.] The Caliphate was, indeed, from the eighth to the eleventh century, a world-wide empire, extending from the Indus to the Pyrenees, but it rested on the oppressive and soul-killing power of a fanatically intolerant religion, forced on the natives at the sword's point; its history is chiefly made up of an endless series of religious wars and palace revolutions, while the gifts it bestowed on its subjects were despotism, the domestic economy of the harem, the degradation of the female sex, and, in the higher classes, the destruction of family life. In the present Indian Empire, on the contrary, there has never been a quarrel among the rulers, a disputed succession is impossible, and no one has ever been persecuted or even placed at a disadvantage on account of his faith. Still sharper is the contrast between the former dominion of Spain in South and Central America and that of British India. The Spanish was a colonial Empire; the natives were distributed as slaves by the colonists through their system of *Encomiendas*, [See Helps's "Spanish Conquest in America," Vol. I., page 197.] crushed under the burden of compulsory service, completely exterminated on the islands, and destroyed by millions in Peru and Mexico. In India, on the contrary, the English have not sought to become colonists and land-owners. The tropical climate itself makes that impossible; no English family stays there to the third generation, and parents are obliged to send their children to a cooler climate to be brought up. Fortunately, alike for England and for India, there are no creoles, nor mulattoes, mongrels, tertiaries, and quaternaries, or by whatever other name the bastard races and half-breeds may be called. In a word, to compare the Spanish and English rule over subject nations would be—to use the Persian simile—like comparing the kingdom of Ahriman to that of Ormuzd.—*Von Dollinger, in Contemporary Review*.

CORRESPONDENCE.

It is distinctly to be borne in mind that we do not by inserting letters convey any opinion favourable to their contents. We open our columns to all without leaning to any; and thus supply a channel for the publication of opinions of all shades, to be found in no other journal in Canada.

No notice whatever will be taken of anonymous letters, nor can we undertake to return letters that are rejected.

Letters should be brief, and written on one side of the paper only. Those intended for insertion should be addressed to the Editor, 162 St. James Street, Montreal; those on matters of business to the Manager, at the same address.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—As there was no bloodshed in the "late duel," and all parties are quite satisfied with the result, it may be opportune to state that an Act is in force in this Province, viz., cap. 78 of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada,—*"An Act respecting compensation to the families of persons killed by accidents or in duels,"*—by which an action will lie, to recover damages for the death of any person caused under such circumstances as amount in law to felony. Every such action shall be for the benefit of the wife, husband, parent and child of the person whose death has been so caused, and may be brought, in the Province of Quebec, by the personal representative, tutor or curator of the deceased. And "when the death of a person has been caused by any wound or injury received in a duel, which wound or injury has been inflicted by the use of any description of firearms or other deadly weapon whatsoever, in such case the person inflicting such wound or injury, and all persons present aiding or abetting the parties in such duel as seconds or assistants therein, may be proceeded against under this Act, although no action for damages could have been brought by the person whose death may be so caused had death not ensued from the infliction of such wound or injury." Under this Act the word "parent" is interpreted as meaning father and mother, grandfather and grandmother, stepfather and stepmother; and the word "child" shall include son and daughter, grandson and granddaughter, stepson and stepdaughter.

So much for the civil law.

Our criminal law affecting duelling is severe. A challenge is a breach of the peace, and in case of death resulting from an encounter, the principal is held to have committed murder, and all parties abetting are accessories thereto.

The Great Law says, "Thou shalt not kill," but the provisions of the law in the Province of Quebec certainly make it injudicious to play at duelling, and should a family man be the "dead hero," the other gentleman will have to face the chances of being made familiar with the hangman's attentions, and of having his estate, if any, applied to the use of "the cousins and the aunts" of his antagonist.

Let each one make his own application.

Yours truly,

WIMBEL.