

A good deal of hard feeling continues to be kindled against the bakers for the manner in which they are keeping up the price of bread. Wheat is cheaper than it has been for many years. So is flour, even the best grades of it being procurable at prices but little if anything in advance of what the poorest have sometimes brought. Nor is labor any dearer. And yet the price keeps up, in such a way that the Lakera must be coining money almost "hand over fist," as he says. There are firms in this city which continue to charge fourteen or fifteen cents for the loaf, a price which is little else than extortionate. The profits made at this rate by bakers who have anything of a custom, must be almost enormous, for of course, they buy all their flour wholesale, which is very much less than what other people can buy it for. And yet even "other people" can buy their flour for very much less now than they have been able to do for years. A pretty shrewd correspondent, writing to a Montreal paper in answer to another correspondent who asked how many loaves can be made out of a barrel of flour, says, it is similar question to the one asking how many gallons of whiskey are in a hogshead, the answer being that if the whiskey be not watered before measurement, it will afford divers extra quarts after watering. In the same way he says with bread, a baker will get nine dozen loaves to nine and a half if the flour be strong. He gives a table which is worthy of inspection.

1 bl. flour costs at the present prices by the car, say \$3.75—made into bread it gives 93 dozen, which at 7 cent retail turns in \$3.31. The expense of turning this into bread (flour, yeast, fat or c. c.) say would be not more than \$2.25 per barrel, or the cost to turn out to the baker would be 26, and he would have 133 loaves at 7c. ea. h. or a profit of \$3.31 cents on each barrel.

This of course is on the supposition that everything is on the square. If any of the little tricks are resorted to which some bakers understand, the profits are so much greater. The same writer gives an extract from an American paper which is instructive.

Edward Atkinson, the statistician, has figured out the cost of a loaf of bread in the Boston market, and presents the results in a very instructive shape. His figures run in this way: Of the value of 100 barrels of flour, \$320 goes to the Dakota farmer, the freight to Bos on will be \$17.50, the barrels will cost \$45, the grinding \$20, and the commissions and cartage \$31, making the total cost of the 100 barrels of flour \$523.50 when the flour reaches Boston. The baker then takes the 100 barrels of flour and adds \$210 worth of oven heat and yeast and \$200 worth of labor, so that when the flour goes into the hop for sale in the shape of 8,000 loaves of bread, the cost \$1,933.50—an equivalent of three and a half cents a pound. For this bread the baker or the retail dealer gets seven cents a pound; that is to say, the baker and a rocer in Boston get about one-half of the money paid for a barrel of flour, the farmer gets a fifth, the railroads one tenth, the miller, merchant, and cooper one fourteenth.

Dr. Vincent of Detroit, whom the Y. M. C. A. of this city got to address them at their annual meeting is deservedly a favorite, not with Toronto audiences only, but everywhere else in Canada where people have had the happiness of hearing him. One reason of the popularity and the success which attends his work, is his possession of a quite unusual degree of that "sanctified common sense" which he very properly regards as so important for the most successful Christian work. He said a great many good things in his address, and gave the young men a great deal of excellent advice.

One thing that everybody likes about Dr. Vincent and men of his stamp is that there is no cant about him. What he believes, he believes most heartily, and speaks it boldly out, but without any of that pious twang in his voice, or tabernacle snivel which many pious young men see fit to adopt when speaking about religious subjects. His hearers feel that they have a man in front of them, not a creature whose religiousness is very much the daughter of sickness—not ill-health, which is a very different matter—and the mother of cant.

Dr. Vincent very properly expressed great contempt for that most contemptible of all shams, the very incarnation of stupidity and humbug, the ordinary church "sociable," at which professing Christians try in some sort of a wholesale, perforce way, to extend the right hand of fellowship to their brethren and sisters in the faith. There probably never was in this world of misleading names and cant phrases, and ridiculous misnomers, a name so misleading, a phrase so redolent of cant, a misnomer so complete in its ridiculousness, as the term "Sociable," applied to these meetings where once a year people who occupy pews in the same church Sunday after Sunday, come together with a self-conscious, awkward, constrained kind of a fashion, to eat cake and buns, and drink tea, hover round in a pitiable sort of a way during the period specially set aside for "sociability"—which by the way is generally limited to fifteen minutes—listen to one or two speeches, "funny" or otherwise, and then go home to sleep the sleep of the just, with a conscience set at rest by the thought that for another year at least the Christian duty of "sociability" had been adequately performed.

There never was a greater delusion. There has been no real sociability. If nine out of every ten people who attend such things were honest they would confess it. What stranger in the congregation has ever found himself heartily welcomed and made to feel at home at one of them? Is there any general disposition, any well-defined attempt to get acquainted with the fellow-Christians who worship Sunday after Sunday under the same walls? None whatever, it may be confidently affirmed. There may be some notable exceptions, doubtless, but their notability consists principally in their being so exceptionable. Is it not true that persons circulate simply among their own acquaintances? That the whole assemblage insensibly divides itself into little cliques and coteries, and that there is absolutely no effort made, very possibly no wish felt, to break up these circles, and produce a general feeling of sympathy and friendship?

Dr. Vincent is right. Genuine cordiality and friendliness between members of the same Christian congregation can never be brought about in a wholesale, perfunctory sort of a way. And that this is the general character of these "tea fights," as they are contemptuously called, cannot be denied. There ought to be cordiality and friendliness among members of the same congregation. Surely no one doubts this. They have

so many things in common. It is a disgraceful thing if any member of a so-called Christian congregation is without a tolerably wide acquaintance among his fellow worshippers, and an inner circle of sincerely warm friends. And yet is this disgraceful thing a rarity? Very far from it, we very much fear. In every congregation, or in every city congregation, at any rate, may be found persons who can honestly say that they have occupied the same pew for months, perhaps even for years, without making a single acquaintance, to say nothing of a friend. Such a state of things is not right. If the Christian church wants to secure the affections both of young men and old men, and young women and old women, then the Christian congregations must turn over a new leaf in this respect.

The Boston Journal complains of the great waste of money every year in printing Congressional records. A host of stuff is printed every year, which is never read, never expected to be read, and which it would be a sinful expenditure of time to attempt to read. The very same thing is true in Canada. There is a vast amount of matter printed every year in the shape of Parliamentary papers and what not, which makes simply so much waste paper, and adds to the fast accumulating heap of printed lumber. No one is benefitted but the printer. Windy orators continue to spout out their platitudes and collapsed commonplaces, which are taken down, and printed as so much political gospel at the expense of the people. Take the Senate Hansard for example. Do these Senators ever utter one single thing that is worthy of preservation? Or if that is considered as putting things rather strongly, could not the printed record of what their Honours do and say every year be reduced in bulk a thousand-fold without the country suffering in any of its interests, moral, political or religious? In their present shape these Hansards are just so much accumulating rubbish. But besides the Hansards there is a vast amount of printing done every year both for the Senate and the House of Commons, and the Legislative Assemblies as well, the money spent for which is simply wasted.

There is no small degree of likelihood that before very long the Canada Presbyterian Church will be stirred to its depths with a heresy trial compared with which the Macdonnell case was comparative child's play. The heretic in this case also is provided by that portion of the new United Church which before union was connected with the Established Church of Scotland, and is no less a person than the well known, popular, genial and perhaps also politic, president of Queen's College, Kingston, Dr. Grant. A sermon preached by him in the Limestone City, made quite a stir there; extracts from it have appeared in the Globe, and altogether quite a serious time of it may be expected. If Dr. Grant has been rightly reported, and the probability is quite that he has been, it is difficult to see how the church authorities can avoid libelling him for heresy. It is said, though, that the doctor is a very difficult man to catch, and that he is remarkably good at giving explanations. One thing is still more difficult to see, and

that is how Doctor Grant can, if he holds such views on the subject of miracles, voluntarily continue his connection with a church whose opinions he must know are diametrically opposed to his own.

Why should it not be made imperative on all lines of railway that milk should be had on sale at all places where there are refreshment-rooms provided? It would be greatly in demand and would be wonderfully beneficial. In Sweden all ardent spirits are forbidden to be sold at railway stations. When certain individuals have a monopoly the public have a right to see that as fully as possible it are served.

What was anticipated in connection with the French operations in China has so far taken place. Christians both foreign and native have been massacred and outraged and it is to be feared that this may extend over the whole country. The Chinese in their unreasoning indignation against the French make no distinction between one class of Christians and another. Supposing these massacres go on what will England and other European nations do? Will they go to war with China or what?

The co-education of the sexes at University College seems to be a great success. At least if the following communication from one of the ladies to a contemporary is to be taken as a fair statement of the case: "I think it will be hard to over estimate the advantages which we receive by attending lectures at the University. When I was at the Brantford Collegiate Institute I found the great difficulty was that there was no one to map out a course of reading for us. The obstacle is now removed by the lecturers, who without exception do all in their power to make the present system of co-education a success. All the lecturers are so helpful to me that I would not care to single out any as particularly beneficial. I do not see that a separate college would benefit us. In the Toronto University we are supported by the best available lecturers, and are treated with the utmost consideration and politeness by professors and students alike. I believe the present method of co-education has been a decided success."

It is difficult to say how the Municipal Institutions of this and other countries are to be put and kept in good working order. Nobody questions their importance. In one sense they are all important, for they train people to manage their own affairs with wisdom and propriety and they are the best bulwark against all those centralizing influences which pave the way so frequently for the loss of freedom altogether. The wonder is that people will not take the trouble involved in such institutions by choosing good men for office and standing by them when they get such. The consequences are what every one deplors. Schomors and log rollers seek and secure places that ought to be occupied by reliable and high-minded men. Jobbery creeps in and everything that is bad. Of course Tweed and his gang were exceptional thieves, still it is to be feared that they were not so unlike many others as all good men would desire. But now is the recognized evil