

make experiments, and they determined that whatever the N. P. might be it should have a chance. The Policy is now fairly at work, and by the help of a good harvest and a large demand for wheat, is able to make a show of accomplishing something. There can hardly be anything like a successful attack upon it by the Opposition, for although Sir Richard Cartwright still believes in the "fly on the wheel," and the *Globe* continues to rave against the measure taken to enrich the manufacturers and impoverish the working people, and Mr. Mackenzie still submits to the tyranny of Mr. Brown—which is breaking up the party—the N. P. will yet command the better and stronger arguments.

So that Sir John Macdonald may turn his hand to some useful and sober work, which is much needed. The Civil Service will bear a good deal of reforming: if the Senate could be improved off the face of the earth it would be in the interests of economy and good government, and a mercy for all but the Senators themselves; but if changes cannot be carried so far—and they cannot at present—there should be changes in that direction at any rate. Then our whole Banking system needs overhauling; and as a great question arising out of that and connected with it, a National Currency could be discussed with advantage. If Government would introduce a measure providing for a gradual extension of the present system of issuing Dominion notes and forbidding any further issue by private banks—not making the Dominion notes legal tender paper, but redeemable in gold—it would satisfy the whole trading community, with the exception of the bankers themselves.

It would be well within the rights and duties of the present Government, if Sir John would introduce a measure giving him authority to ask for a renewal of the reciprocity treaty with the United States. Conservatives are loudly proclaiming that where Mr. Brown failed Sir John will succeed. Perhaps. Everybody would like to see him try, for what we want now is free participation in the trade and commercial life of this continent. It is a poor and a foolish thing to set up the scarecrow of annexation whenever commercial reciprocity or the abolition of the Customs line by a Zollverein is mentioned; a commercial treaty does not presuppose a political union, and Sir John may make one more attempt in that direction without fear of losing the support of the majority. The *Globe* would storm, but its thunder never kills.

The real nature of Mr. Parnell's mission to this continent is by this time perfectly apparent; he is more anxious about political agitation than to secure funds for the poor people out of whom famine is eating the life. Almost every speech he delivers contains a fierce tirade against England and the English government of Ireland, and almost every speech is packed with charges against home relief committees which every intelligent person who hears or reads what he says must know to be false. The mendacity with which the agitator repeats and emphasises his false statements would be astounding if we did not know the nature of the work he has undertaken and the fanaticism to which he has given himself over.

Let me commend to Mayor Rivard and all who propose to give Mr. Parnell an official reception the following specimen of the kind of truthfulness and honour practised by their proposed guest:—

SPRINGFIELD, Jan. 30, 1880.—Mr. Parnell, speaking in this city to-night, referring to the cable despatch of Lord Alfred Churchill said:—"This young nobleman says that my statement that the relief fund of the Duchess of Marlborough is being administered for political purposes is false. Now, I have the best and most recent information from the distressed districts, that my statement is absolutely true, and that all persons out of favour with their landlords are precluded from participation. More than one parish priest also has already complained that the fund is being administered for sectarian purposes. The word of the descendant, on the one hand, of the notorious Sarah Jennings, mistress of the Duke of York, and on the other hand, of Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, of whom Macaulay writes as follows:—"That he owed his rise to his sister's dishonour, and that he had been kept by the most profuse, imperious and shameless of harlots"—will be scanned somewhat closely by the American people, who at least can boast that their ancestors were honest men

and women." Adverting to the Mansion House Committee, he said that apart from the hierarchy there was not a single member of it who possessed the confidence or respect of the Irish people.

I expected that every respectable newspaper on the continent would have sent out a protest against this insolent outrage—for it was no less; but scarcely any notice has been taken of it, the *Montreal Gazette* calling it "an indecent attack on the young nobleman," and the slander of the long dead Sarah Jennings "a dirty bit of history"—evidently knowing about as much of history, dirty or clean, as Mr. Parnell. Sarah Jennings was never "mistress of the Duke of York," nor was ever word spoken against the womanly virtue of Sarah, the beautiful Duchess of Marlborough, until Mr. Parnell opened his mouth at Springfield. Is it not a shame that such slander should be spoken against the character of a woman who in a corrupt age was as conspicuous for her virtue as her personal beauty? Mr. Parnell made the extremely absurd statement the other day that the history of Ireland was proscribed in schools; it is evident that he is as ignorant of English history as he is of the code of honour. Mr. Parnell meant Arabella Churchill, of course, but when such matters are talked about care should be used.

I should like Mr. Parnell, or some of his friends who know his affairs, to answer a question or two for the sake of satisfying the public. Mr. Parnell is an Irish landlord: how much has he reduced the rent of his farms? Mr. Parnell is a man of considerable wealth: how much has he contributed out of his own pocket toward the relief of the hungry? Mr. Parnell charges the Mayor of Dublin, the Duchess of Marlborough, and all others who do not follow his lead, with administering the funds committed to them in a prejudiced and sectional manner, which is authoritatively denied; but Mr. Parnell's own committee is reported as relieving only their own sympathisers. Can he deny this, and give proof of his truthfulness?

Our wisdom will be to let Parnell come or go, and all who like to do him honour; but let us all give soon and generously to the poor starving people of Ireland—to them, not to Parnell.

Here is a specimen of modern Christian charity, culled from the "religious item" column of one of the organs of a prominent sect among us:—

"Rev. Mr. Macrae and Professor Robertson Smith have indulged in personal abuse of those who are prosecuting them for heresy to such an extent as to disgust their friends."

Defective construction a little spoils the force of the sentence. Is it the prosecution for heresy "to such an extent" which disgusts the friends? or is it the personal abuse to such an extent, or the extent of the heresy itself? Probably this is what was intended to be said: "Rev. Mr. Macrae and Prof. Robertson Smith have indulged to such an extent in personal abuse of those who are prosecuting them for heresy as to disgust their friends." The thing sounds well, because it is their own friends who are said to say it. It is a style of abuse imitated from political editorials and adapted to the service and protection of orthodoxy. Were it true to the letter, it still conceals entirely the amount of personal abuse these heretics may have received before they were goaded to retort, while it fails utterly to describe the peculiar kind of "friends" who have been driven to entertain the "disgust" referred to. Much depends on that. There are friends whose disgust is a positive luxury. It is an honour to be persecuted "for righteousness' sake." The vagueness and safety of this style of attack are its two salient points. Study it and copy carefully all ye who are filled with religious bigotry, and the world will rapidly learn to know you thoroughly.

Bank dividends are but the echo or reflection of the condition of trade. The announcement of the dividends of Joint Stock Banks in England is at present of special interest in determining for us whether the long-looked-for revival of English trade has become a reality or is still a myth. The balance of proof is in favour of the former opinion. The dividends have not decreased, and in one instance only has the "rest" been trenched upon to maintain the