

reason or honesty, have people to demand twice as much as they bargained for? Madame Rivé-King was encored, and many looked surprised when she only bowed to the house—now Madame Rivé-King was paid \$200 I believe for playing two pieces—and the audience invited her to favour them with another \$100 worth. Mr. Sims Reeves has set a good example in England—he will never respond to an *encore* unless he is paid for it.

We are likely to have a good deal of sensation, if not some experience of an ecclesiastical storm in the "Anglican Diocese of Montreal," as it is grandiloquently called. The time for the election of a Bishop draws near, and the party which calls itself "High," and the party which calls itself "Low," are equally agitated. It is quite true that there is no Cathedral for the Bishop—and that he will have no civil status beyond that of any other clergyman in Montreal—and that the title is purely ecclesiastical, just as is the case with the dignitaries of the Methodist Episcopal Church, or the Reformed Episcopal Church; still there will be some considerable responsibility attaching to the office, because considerable influence must go with it. That is why each party is so anxious to secure the election of one who is in sympathy with its views. Caucuses have been held, and several names suggested at them, but it looks as if the choice will lie between Principal Lobley for the High Church party, and Dean Bond for the Evangelicals.

Two things the Episcopalians might do with great credit to their common sense and generosity—narrow their claims, as put forth in their titles, that is first. "Bishop" is not at all objectionable, but it should be "Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Montreal," and not "Bishop of Montreal." "Rectors," "Deans," "Canons," &c., are merely ecclesiastical titles in this country—as far as the Protestant portion of the community is concerned—and nothing more. To talk of "parishes" here is absurd—but I heard some poor people talking of "dissenters" the other day, and on asking the reason was told by them that the Episcopal Church in Canada is in exactly the same position as the Episcopal Church in England. They know the Catechism well, and they should learn a few other things.

And then the Episcopalians of Canada would help on their own life and work, and better exemplify Christian charity if they would hold more communication with other denominations in the Church. It does seem a pity that the Old World exclusiveness in that matter should be fostered here. There they have an excuse—here there is none; for there the Episcopal Church is by law established, and by law governed—here it is in a different position. It has no more connection with the state than have the Methodists. But, just exactly as in England, there is no interchange of pulpits between the Episcopal and other denominations, but a proud and hurtful exclusiveness; not on the ground of law, and not on the ground of creed distinctions, but on grounds simply and purely ecclesiastical. I commend this to the attention of both parties in the Episcopal Church of Canada.

Canon Baldwin has returned from Europe with an increased power to read "The Signs of the Times." But, judging from a sermon printed in the Montreal *Star* on that subject, the Canon is not quite clear as to the reading. He is reported as having said, "First (as a sign of the times) was the exhibition of the ideas of certain political economists as to the power of trade and civilization. Many of his hearers, no doubt, had seen Buckle's 'History of Civilization,' a book which has embodied the ideas of many on this subject, and which was looked upon as a great work on civilization. Mill and others had written in the same strain as Buckle, and their idea had been that commerce and civilization had the power, inherent in themselves, to still the passions of the human heart, to still the great restless ocean of public thought, and to produce not only the calm, but insensible at first, and sensible afterwards, progress towards the great and good." On reading that I was startled, for I thought I knew Buckle and Mill—but could remember nothing in their teachings that sounded like that. And I took down my Buckle and my Mill and failed to find it anywhere. The nearest approach to it seems to be in this sentence—"looking at things upon a large scale, the religion of mankind is the effect of their improvement, not the cause of it." And then he goes on to admit that looking at things upon a small scale "circumstances will occasionally occur which disturb the general order, and apparently, reverse the natural process." Would the Canon go further than that? And before giving the teachings of Buckle and Mill wouldn't he read them once more?

But the deduction from the Exhibition of 1851 was the most peculiar. After telling of the opening, and the singing of the 100th Psalm on the occasion, he says:—But no sooner was the Exhibition over than war broke out," and really the Canon rates that Exhibition as if it was the cause of that war. More "signs of the times" are "the fallacy of philosophy, the impotency of human intellect, the utter failure of human wisdom." Dear me—it is time to get frightened. If we

are such poor bankrupt mortals as the Canon says we are, having no philosophy, no strength of intellect, and no wisdom that is of use to us what can we do? If we haven't intellect, or wisdom enough left to take hold of the Canon's teaching are we to be blamed for it?

And so Mr. Laflamme is counted out. The question of the judgeship is settled without Mr. Mackenzie's intervention, and—well, one more national mercy is added to the list of good things done for us.

"Unhappy that I am." The ecclesiastical circles of the Western metropolis are made angry by the mild criticisms of "Quien Sabe" in the SPECTATOR. Letters of remonstrance have rained in upon me, but they cannot appear, because the gentlemen have forgotten their cards, or to give me some clue to their personality. No harm will come of these criticisms, ladies and gentlemen; on the contrary, good will be the result, for some among you will see themselves as calm onlookers see them. But I would advise you to moderate your anger, or we shall begin to think that "Quien Sabe" has been speaking some plain words in truth.

If Toronto is to become the leading city in the Dominion, as it boasts it will, there must be some considerable changes in many aspects of its city life. That is, if the criticism a gentleman sends me is at all fair. He writes thus of the churches and the city: "I will give them (the churches) credit for being desirous of doing good, but they are not brilliant; and perhaps brilliancy is not required, for there seems to be a lack of it among the laity as well as the clergy; in fact, this is an "rus in urbe" sort of a place, a large village, a sort of hobbledehoy. The municipal government of Montreal may not be good, but here it is positively bad. They have the worst sidewalks of any place I know of; the streets are abominably paved, and the lanes between streets in respectable and even fashionable districts abound with decayed tomatoes, apples, parings, dead rats and all sorts of indescribable garbage. In addition to all this the taxes are enormous—heavier than I could have thought it possible any community would have endured. I will refrain from giving you examples now. I don't know where the money goes, but I hope there are no Boss Tweeds feathering their nests here." I commend this to the Torontonians as coming from an impartial observer who had no idea that his words would be printed when he wrote them.

When will our brethren of the Yankeeland learn that at times they must come off second best? At present they do not seem to understand that anything in law or physical strength can be on the side opposed to them. When the Geneva award was made they praised the glories of arbitration, took the money, and felt justified in keeping the big surplus which remained in their hands when all possible claims had been met. But when the Fisheries award went against them they howled with pain and rage, execrating everybody concerned in the matter. And now the Canadian Hanlan has beaten the American Courtney at boat-racing, and there is wild talk of selling the race; that is, they would rather believe their countryman a thorough-paced scoundrel than that another man may have more muscular power and more skill in the use of a pair of paddles. It hardly speaks well for a people when they are so ready to believe in villainy.

What has England gained by the acquisition of Cyprus? It has already cost a considerable sum, and is going to cost more. It has no harbours; has a pauper population, and is a splendid place for killing off troops, or civilians, by fever. The Earl of Beaconsfield went to the great European fair and bought a pig in a poke—and still he is a great statesman.

He is a great statesman—that is, in the eyes of Mr. Levy, of the *Daily Telegraph*, and of Mr. Walter, of the *Times*, who are looking out for honours as payment for their fealty. In the estimation of all thinking people the Earl is dropping, and will soon be less than zero.

If England should have the misfortune to take Afghanistan, it would have to take Persia also, because the line of defence in Asia Minor would be cut into like a wedge by Persia. And this is going to land England in a most expensive kind of amusement. The people will awake by and by to a conviction that they have to pay overmuch for the luxury of a "spirited foreign policy."

The Afghan question is assuming very considerable proportions for the people of England. It seems to mean war, and war of the most troublesome and unsatisfactory kind—unsatisfactory because no material good and no glory can be got out of it. Afghanistan is described as a land of rocks, sand, desert, ice and snow. If a small force be taken, it will be beaten; if a large one, it will be starved. The Afghans are anxious to be annexed neither to Russia nor to England—are anxious for nothing but independence, and for that they will fight, and they can fight well.