

there is no demand for their use. Secondly, the medium of exchange in use being of a fluctuating value, a larger margin must be allowed for profit by the manufacturer and producer. It is months from the date of production to the date of realization. Interest upon capital must be charged and the risk of fluctuation in the value of that which is to be received in payment, added. Hence high prices acting as a protection to the foreign producer. To the President as to every student of political economy, nothing is clearer than that the greater part of the burden of existing prostration in the United States, for the want of a sound financial system, falls upon the workingman, who must produce the wealth, and the salaried man who superintends and conducts business. The burden falls upon them in two ways:—by the deprivation of employment and by the decreased purchasing power of their salaries.

With regard to foreign relations, the President congratulates his countrymen upon the good will reigning between the United States and all other nations. He makes a rather remarkable reservation, however, respecting Spain, on account of the Cuban war. The paragraph has created considerable indignation in Madrid, where it was construed as a threat. Indeed, the language of the President is sufficiently explicit, for he goes the length of saying that if the strife in Cuba is to continue purposelessly and indefinitely, "it may make some positive steps on the part of other powers a matter of self-necessity."

It has been said and, we fear, with truth, that the South has no longer any thing to hope from General GRANT. The parts of his message relating to Southern affairs seem to point to no other conclusion. While deprecating the necessity of Federal interference, especially armed intervention, in the internal concerns of any State, he holds to his initial mistake in regard to the recognition of KELLOGG, justifies his course in Louisiana, and intimates not obscurely that he is ready to act in the same way should similar circumstances require. Considering the enormous majorities cast throughout the South, always excepting poor South Carolina, in favor of the Democratic party, it is perhaps natural that President GRANT should indulge in no superfluous generosity towards the rebellious States, but it was hoped all the same that he would at least adhere to the policy of non-partisanship and non-intervention.

Some surprise has been expressed at the total silence of the President on the subject of the Reciprocity Treaty. No capital need be made of the circumstance, as it is easily explained. The instrument is not a treaty, but only a draft or memorandum. It has already been submitted to the Senate, in a separate message sent in shortly before the close of the last session. At that time, the President recommended immediate attention to the same, but the Senate adjourned without taking any action. The matter thus passed out of the President's hands. Furthermore, it is presumable that General GRANT is sufficiently aware of the feeling of the Senate on the subject, not to give undue prominence to the same. He probably knows, what must be evident to any attentive reader of the American press, that it is no use insisting upon a measure, which, from present appearances at least, has no chance of favorable consideration from the American Senate.

THE BATTLE OF PRINCIPLES.

In referring to a late speech pronounced by the Marquis of SALISBURY, the present Secretary for India, a writer recalls the curious words uttered by the same nobleman, then Lord CRANBORNE, in a debate on a clause of the Reform Bill, of 1867. In a passionate outburst, he exclaimed: "the monarchy is dead, the aristocracy is doomed, democracy is triumphant." The writer aforesaid, contrasting these words with the actual Tory sentiments of their author, takes occasion to read him a lesson on consistency, and proceeds to show that

Lord CRANBORNE was right when he leaned to the theory that the present century has been fatal to monarchy. He then goes on to establish his proposition by passing in review all the governments of Europe. This is one of those bold, loose statements which lead so many unreflecting readers astray. On going over the list given by the writer, it will found that, so far from making good his statement, he has succeeded only in showing that democracy has failed in overturning a single one of the European monarchies. The war between democracy and monarchy broke out in 1789. The BOURBON was guillotined and the Republic proclaimed. We know how long it lasted. BONAPARTE replaced the BOURBON. In 1815, the BOURBON replaced BONAPARTE. In 1831, ORLEANS replaced the BOURBON. In 1848 the Republic overthrew ORLEANS. In 1851, BONAPARTE overturned the Republic. In 1870, the Republic deposed BONAPARTE, but it is clear that the present Septennate is leading direct to monarchical restoration.

Take Italy next. The Carbonari took up the principles of the Sans-Culottes as far back as 1821, and have been fighting their battles ever since. True, they revolutionized Sicily and the Peninsula, but they did not succeed in establishing a republic. Italy is now ruled by one monarch instead of several, and power is more centralized there than ever it was before. Greece was torn from the grasp of Turkey. But the republic of Pericles was not restored; a monarchy was founded instead. Belgium was separated from the thrall of Holland, but only to raise a Leopoldine dynasty of its own. Hungary long contended with Austria, but not with democratic aspirations. KOSSUTH was not heeded, DEAK'S policy prevailed and FRANZ-JOSEPH was crowned King of the Magyars, amid the wildest enthusiasm. Prussia and Russia are sternly monocratic. Norway and Sweden, Denmark, Holland and Portugal are swayed by monarchs whose families are dear to the people. Spain is in a chaotic condition, but the accession of the Prince of the ASTURIAS is among the probabilities. As to England, who will deny that royalty is associated in the mind of her people with the security of their rights and a proper share of liberty?

Our writer has not stated the question properly, and he certainly cannot prove it in the sense in which he puts it. We apprehend that the battle of principles in Europe, and, indeed, all over the world, is not between monarchy and democracy, but between constitutional liberty and absolutism. Thus understood, the triumph is undoubtedly in favor of the former. Everywhere, but in Russia and Prussia, the principles of freedom have prevailed. In those two countries a species of despotism is still mercilessly exercised.

The mass of mankind love liberty, but the liberty which they love is constitutional liberty—a freedom that can be enjoyed in a monarchy just as well as in a republic. They hate tyranny, but they hate it equally in the polyarch as in the monarch. The mob—the old spectral Demos of the Greeks—is as hideous a tyranny in a republic, as in a monarchy. Popular radicalism is as bad as autocratic absolutism. If by monarchy our writer means absolutism or Caesarism, he is right in stating that the present feeling of the age is against it. If he means constitutional monarchy, as in England, the facts will not bear him out.

OUR WINTER SPORTS.

People living outside of Canada, especially Englishmen, accustomed to the mild temperature of their native island, have very false ideas about our winters. They imagine that we are literally isolated from the rest of the world for three or four months of the year, are buried under mountains of snow like the Esquimaux, endure the hardships of Siberia, and that our commercial prosperity is impeded by the rigors of our climate. There is no doubt that, until ten or fifteen years ago, the length and severity of our winters were

a serious drawback to our mercantile progress, but since the era of railways, this objection has in great measure disappeared, and it will be totally removed when our means of communication are perfected, as they soon must be, to meet the growing necessities of this promising country. When the beautiful favorite of Louis XVI. shrugged her ivory shoulders, on hearing of the cession of Canada to England, and consoled her ladies-in-waiting with the remark that the loss consisted only of a few acres of snow, she little understood the capabilities and adaptabilities of our winter climate, nor how easily the spirit of enterprise could conquer the few obstacles which it presented.

To our winters we are indebted for the salubrity of our climate. We may be literally buried in snow, but life is the more enjoyable on that account. Indeed, there is a keen and pleasurable enjoyment in these winter months which one never experiences in warmer climates. The air is sharp, but the pure oxygen exhilarates the blood, and with moderate exercise a genial glow insinuates itself into the whole system. There is no dampness in the atmosphere, and consequently few of the maladies incident to moist, rainy countries are felt. Some physicians have as much confidence in the dryness of the Canadian climate as in southern regions, for the relief of pulmonary complaints.

The fact that Canadians appreciate and enjoy their winters is shown by the number of sports which distinguish that season. We say nothing of tobogganing, which is reserved particularly for children. Nor of sleighing, which, as a mere amusement or exercise, is peculiar to the aged, the infirm and to mothers of families. We refer more especially to our three great winter sports—snow-shoeing, curling, and skating.

The first of these has, of late years, been reduced almost to a science. The different clubs established throughout the country have systematized it admirably, while annual games, competitive marches, and an authentic record of special tramps have brought about feats of swiftness and endurance which recall those of the legendary *coureurs des bois*. As a manly exercise, snow-shoeing surpasses all our winter and summer sports. It requires fortitude, courage, and perseverance. It has a wonderful effect on muscular development. With proper precautions, it can conquer lung disease. Mentally and aesthetically, its results are admirable. The memorable torchlight procession across the brow of Mount Royal, in honour of the Governor-General, two years ago, was as poetic a spectacle as we ever witnessed, and Lord DUFFERIN declared that he had never seen anything more picturesque.

Canada is second only to Scotland in its cultivation of curling. Our clubs throughout the Dominion are not only numerous, but they are animated by a commendable spirit of emulation, and many of their scores have been remarkable. The Bonspiel is well adapted to middle-aged men. It is quiet, clean, and not fatiguing. It is a game of precision, requiring nerve, tact, and calculation.

Canadian skating is unsurpassed in the world, and this compliment applies particularly to our female skaters. There are few sights more beautiful than that of a pretty girl gyrating on her silver sandals. And positively there is nothing more characteristic and fairy-like than a masquerade on the ice, such as we have had in our principal cities during the past few years, where you see an Albanian corsair plotting with a Calabrian bandit; a Tyrolean hunter flirting with a Gazza Ladra; a Castilian girl dancing a national dance to the sound of tambourine and castanets; a Mandarin waving his tropical fan; a painted Huron returning to revisit his ancient Hochelaga; Satan himself coming up to cool himself and while away an hour in chasing with a pitchfork a troop of imps in the shape of swart, ugly negroes; and queerest of all, Mephistophiles skating side by side with a modest, demure nun. And such skating!

So long as Canadians maintain their winter sports, there need be no complaints

made against the severity of the climate, for, admitting that it has its disadvantages, they are amply counterbalanced by the health, vigour, enjoyment and manliness which the season imparts.

SCHOOLS OF DESIGN.

The aesthetical sentiment in youth ought to be developed as early as possible. In children this cannot be done through the imagination merely by means of books, for the mind is not sufficiently expanded to admit of such instruction; but it may be done through the eye, by the aid of the pictorial art. There is much discussion going on in England and the United States in regard to elementary or primary instruction, and all the best judges agree that hand in hand with rudimental notions of literature and science, there should be some attempt at schooling the childish mind in the principles of art. If the tendency of the age is to popularize letters and science, we see no reason why art should be excluded, inasmuch as the aesthetical instinct is the one that is most developed in a very great number of children.

We should propose, therefore, that in all our colleges, academies and schools, there ought to be classes of Design. We think that this has been too much neglected heretofore. Strange to say, children are put at the earliest age, by their parents and teachers, to the study of music, and kept to it whether they have a talent for it or not. Now it is well known that a large proportion of children have neither taste nor talent for music. The time they spend at it is lost time and a great burden for children. The theoretical study of music is a difficult science, which young minds cannot master, and the mechanical execution of it on the violin or piano is a task, and not a recreation for those whom nature has not endowed with proper dispositions. We are not writing against music. Far from it. As an art, we rank it above painting, as more varied in its scope, and far more expressive in its psychological effects. But we hold that, as an exercise for children, it is inferior to drawing.

The advantages of learning to draw are chiefly aesthetical, it is true, but this in itself is no little recommendation. According to each one's fancy, or talent, an album of crayons may become a lyric, an idyl or a tragedy. It is a pleasant thing too to be able to sketch whatever one sees in animate or inanimate nature—in quiet nooks, on wooded heights, in grassy valleys, on the seaboard or the riverside, in white winter, in green spring, in multi-coloured summer, in russet autumn. We have admired a beautiful sketch of a scene on the Mississippi, hastily taken on the back of a common commercial card, as the packet steamed by. The author was no professional artist, but he had learned to draw at school. We have seen an album of ruins sketched in the North of France, by a young man who was busy with scientific studies, and who amused himself once a week with his pencil, on the Thursday holidays. What souvenirs, too, the faithful crayon can preserve for us. How many scenes witnessed only once in life, serious or ludicrous, grave or gay, can a few pencil strokes keep indelible for pleasant and eternal remembrance. Drawing was the chief solace of Prince Albert's empty life, and it was the sole occupation of poor Carlotta at Tervueren.

No special aptitude is required for drawing as for music. Of course, there are stiff, awkward fingers that can never learn to trace graceful lines on paper, but the great majority of children can. Most children have the bump of imitation more or less developed, and their book margins, copy-books or wrappers are generally covered with grotesque attempts at design.

We think this subject should engage the attention of our Councils of Public Instruction. In our colleges, schools of design should be established at low rates, and all the students encouraged to enter them. We have not referred to the utilitarian aspect of the question, because it is obvious.