

turn to lead the devotion it would be better still, perhaps. I hope Mr. Ferrier will keep this well before his political *confreres*, for they are greatly in need of such exercise.

When the news of Mr. McNamee's committal to jail for ten days for contempt of Court on Tuesday flew through the city, a great many people said: "Serves him right." I have a profound respect for the dignity of the law, and a proper horror of the crime of compounding a felony, but I have also a profound respect for personal rights. Undoubtedly Mr. McNamee did grossly insult the Court and fling rash epithets at certain law officers; but there is something to be said for Mr. McNamee. The loss of \$15,000 is beyond a joke for any man, and if his first care is to get it back no one can wonder at it. But in this case the loser has been treated in some quarters as if his anxiety about it was only food for fun. The Crown took up the prosecution of the supposed robbers, but did not consult the man robbed, and treated him as if he had no sort of interest in the matter.

At last the Crown Prosecutor treated him as exactly on a par with the prisoners, and charged him in open Court with collusion. That is a grave charge and should not be lightly made, and as it seems to me, Mr. Mousseau did this part of his work in a somewhat rough and offensive way. Lawyers make a mistake if they imagine that they can say what they like, no matter how defamatory of a man's character, so long as they say it in Court. They do not lose their personality in that of their client. Mr. Mousseau should not have made such a statement until he was fully prepared to bring forward facts to substantiate it. That was the moment, I think, for the exercise of power and the display of dignity by the presiding magistrate. If he had listened to the objection raised by Mr. McNamee's lawyer, and compelled M. Mousseau to file an affidavit, and gone to work to sift the charge of collusion, the subsequent disgraceful scenes would never have happened. The case was about to be adjourned, and the last words of the Crown Prosecutor were flung at the man who had lost the money, branding him as a criminal of the worst kind; could it be expected that an "ordinary citizen," not making much pretence to Sainthood, would not lose his temper and self-control? I think not, and most of us imagine that citizens are to be protected as well as law-officers of the Crown. M. Mousseau called Mr. McNamee hard names and did not prove his words—of course it will be said that he was not bound to furnish evidence there and then, but I want to show the provocation—and Mr. McNamee called M. Mousseau hard names and did not prove his words by a statement of facts, which was certainly a mistake on one, if not on both sides. The question is, Who was the first offender, and who had the first demand upon the magistrate's protection? I am not a lawyer, and can speak only as a layman and may be wrong.

Mr. Desnoyers confessed that Mr. McNamee's violence had caused him to lose his head, and that on cool and mature reflection he had come to the conclusion to convict Mr. McNamee for contempt of Court; but rumour has it that Mr. Desnoyers' reflections were helped and his decision decided by the lawyers, who had started a petition to the Quebec Government to remove Mr. Desnoyers from office. This, it seems to me, was rather precipitate on the part of the lawyers, and shows that they are quite as capable of losing their temper and their head as Mr. McNamee or Mr. Desnoyers. They surely might have waited to see what the Judge of Quarter Sessions would do to vindicate the majesty of the law.

I congratulate M. L. H. Frechette, our French-Canadian poet. He has taken honours at the French Academy above all competitors. The message from M. Camille Doucet, Secretary of the Academy, reads:—

"Your poem, *Fleurs Boreales*, and your sonnet, *Les Oiseaux de Neiges*, have been crowned by the French Academy over all competitors."

That is ample honour; but better still, it carries two thousand dollars as a prize. Poetry begins to pay, written in Canada, and valued outside.

SIR,—In your editorials of the 5th instant, you say:—"I am glad to see that it is proposed to form a Sanitary Association in Montreal." Every householder and tenant, will, doubtless, re-echo your words.

I will suppose that the Association is formed—good—but the question will remain, what practical benefit can result from its formation? The ready answer is, NOTHING, unless adequate funds are supplied to carry out its recommendations.

What can the Association recommend for good, if it is in ignorance of the conditions required for the proper drainage of the city?

You say:—"Montreal is situated so as to command every advantage which sanitary science can desire, and yet it is one of the worst drained cities on the continent."

In making that statement you do so without knowledge of the subject. Montreal has been pronounced by some of the most eminent civil engineers not only of Canada, but of the United States, as a city very difficult to drain; one of these engineers says it is the most difficult. These engineers are all practical men in their own especial calling—they are neither theologians nor politicians. Upon subjects connected with Church and State they never venture an opinion in public, and they wisely abstain from topics which they are not competent to discuss. These engineers who have been consulted by our Civic Government can give the most unqualified denial to the statement that "Montreal is one of the worst drained cities on the continent;" they would, I think, rather say, and that with truth, that it is one of the best drained cities in America, taking into consideration its topography and its contourage.

I am ready to admit that the drainage is not perfect, and that it is capable of improvement. In admitting this, I say that, without a preliminary survey and the collection of proper engineering data, nothing can be done to remedy the existing defects.

In the City of Boston, about four years ago, a Sanitary Association was formed, which after a careful study of their duties, represented to the City Council the necessity for a preliminary survey, and the desirability for getting sound information towards a complete system of sewerage and drainage. The City Council, in answer to the representations of the Sanitary Commission, ordered the surveys to be made, and paid the cost of them, which amounted to about \$40,000, and since have expended nearly \$1,500,000 for drainage.

Will the proposed Montreal Sanitary Association recommend an outlay of even \$10,000 for a preliminary survey? Will the Corporation of the city of Montreal vote such an amount for such a purpose? Will the citizens consent to be taxed to the extent of \$375,000 to perfect the drainage of Montreal, even if such a consummation were possible?

Without a very considerable outlay nothing can be done to materially improve the drainage of the city. The Road Committee, though by no means infallible, is at times in thorough earnest. It has recommended the complete drainage of St. Catherine, Crescent and St. Sophia Streets and other important thoroughfares, but it has been met with the continual and stereotyped phrase of the Finance Committee—NO FUNDS. It has also had to encounter the opposition of the proprietors of houses who build them to rent them, not to live in them; in fact, the proprietors say to the Road Committee and the Health Committee: "You may build the drains, you may construct immense sewers, provided we are not assessed to pay for them."

Again, Sir, there is a proverb with which you must be familiar:—it's an ill bird that dirt its own nest." It may not, probably, have occurred to your mind that by inferring that the city of Montreal is a very dirty ill conditioned city, full of pestilential vapours, a very cess-pool, you are tending to drive away all strangers and visitors and thereby injuring the shareholders of our railways and steamboats, the proprietors of our hotels, the trade of our shop keepers and all others from whom our newspaper editors and proprietors derive their revenue by advertising.

Thomas D. King.

The result of the Chicago Convention is a surprise to almost everybody. Grant had played his game long and well; with a thorough knowledge of the American people he had so persistently tickled them just where they most like to be tickled, that it is a wonder to find him now flung aside and all his labour lost. Ever since he left the White House he has been scheming how to get back; all the travel and popularity-hunting tended that way, and although his two terms were fruitful in all possible vices, and he had proved himself incapable of filling the office efficiently, except in the interest of his friends, it appeared at one time as if he had succeeded and would occupy the White House again for an indefinite period. But wise counsels have prevailed, and the third term idea is effectually crushed.

The strange thing about it is that the man probably better fitted to fill the office than any other in all the States has been nominated by the Convention. Mr. Garfield has established a reputation for honesty and ability, of which his friends are justly proud, and if he be elected by the popular vote, it will assure for the United States a term of just and able government, so far as the President can influence the political affairs of the people.