

I am attacking the principle of religion ; not at all ; but I do, and will always attack and condemn the actions of those prominent professors of religion whose actions are so diametrically opposed to their professions. The Methodist Church bobs up serenely now so as not to be "out of the swim." Now why is it that these houses are divided against themselves, and is it any wonder that they create comment. In regard to the Methodist matter, the latest trouble arose out of the building contract. All through the transactions of this matter, as I am told by a well informed party, there would appear to have been some "funny" work—a case of who would be the sharpest. It was apparent at the trial that some one tampered with the specifications, and the parties on one side must have sworn to that which was not true. Take, for instance, the signing of the McDonald contract. McDonald is positive he refused to sign the contract till the ten dollar penalty clause was struck out, and, in fact, that he did not sign till it was erased. On the other hand, Architect Hooper swears that one day while the work was in progress, he caught McDonald crossing out the clause in question. Now who is the liar?—one of the two must be. Then there is that missing page, with the signature, and the addition that was made after the tenders were opened. Who was the thief?—for he must have been a thief who tore out and burnt that page. Some one connected with the transaction did the deed, and both sides swear on the Holy Scriptures that they (the persons) are perfectly ignorant of the fate of that page. Of what earthly use is the administering of an oath to such people? It seems not only a farce, but an insult to the scriptures, to the judge, to an intelligent jury and to an honorable counsellor, to parade such cases in our courts of justice? Now it was proved in evidence that the specification, from which the page was torn, had been in the architect's office for several months. That in itself does not prove that the architect destroyed the missing page, but it would be interesting to know who had access to these documents during all that time. I was sorry for Mr. Bodwell's withdrawal from the case, but it was the only honorable course left open to him. He had scored a brilliant point in his opening cross-examination, and the circumstance that transpired during that lunch hour must have been very serious indeed to have caused him to take off the gloves while scoring such a point as he did. There was talk of placing the case before the grand jury, but it is said that there was not sufficient time to enable the authorities to gather together all the facts, and most probably it will come up at the next assizes.

I have received the following letter this week :

"MY DEAR PAPA GRIN-ATER:—Your letters on the topics of the day are enjoyed immensely ; but don't you think it rather wicked to seek amusement "behind the scenes" at a theatre. You know as a father you should not set such an example for your sons ; and, by the way, you were evidently jealous of those same sons as I expect they, being younger than

you, cut you out with the nervous young ladies. I wonder what you were doing behind there anyway, surely not standing in the way like the pretty young men. The proper place for you would have been a nice cosy seat in the parquette, where the wind could have whistled down your back every time the door opened, and swayed the few stray wisps of hair on the back of your dear old head. As a fond daughter, I beg of you, dear Papa Grin-ater not to visit such a wicked place again and above all do not *take* so much before going that you imagine you see young men appearing from all parts of the stage when in reality they quietly entered from what is known as centre back, no wonder your dear old nose has such a bulbous appearance in your photograph. Write soon, and believe me your loving little daughter,  
DOTTY QUAYER."

DOTTY QUAYER."

The above is from a lady. During my peregrinations through the lonely vale of tears I have learned the wisdom of never talking back to a woman and leaving the fair sex generally severely alone.

PERE GRINATOR.

THE NEW GOVERNMENT.

The *Commercial Journal* of last week contains the following on the political situation :

Sir John Abbott has at last retired from the premiership of the Dominion. It has long been understood that this was his intention, but there were those supposed to be more or less in the confidence of the Government who were continually interjecting the possibility of his remaining at the head of things, "provided his medical advisers said that his ailment was not constitutional." The truth, however, appears to have been that, for a variety of reasons—not in any way referring to the Hon. gentleman's qualifications as an able man, a politician, and a leader—it was possible that the present Minister of Justice might not fill the bill satisfactorily. But, in the words of Napoleon, Sir John can now say "*J'y suis et J'y reste*"—"I have got there and I intend to stay." When Sir John Abbott assumed the position rendered vacant by the death of Sir John A. Macdonald, it was manifest that, on account of his advanced years, it could not be expected that he would occupy the office for any lengthened period. No one doubted for a moment that he was the best and most available man. Indeed, without his temporary assumption of the chieftainship, Sir John Thompson could never have been made leader of the Government. For many reasons, it was regarded as necessary that a Protestant, and he from the Province of Quebec, should take the dead leader's place. During Sir John Abbott's tenure of office, not a few matters of a trying—not to say burning—nature have come up, and been so dealt with that their ultimate settlement will be much more easy for the new Premier than had he been compelled to handle them in the first instance. Probably, next to Sir John Macdonald, Sir John Abbott is the best tactician in Canada, Sir Charles Tupper not excepted, for, in what may be termed political *finesse*, the latter is somewhat

wanting. Sir John Abbott was always cautious and conciliatory, and, however great a victory he might have planned to achieve, it was not his idea to push his advantage to undue limits, nor was he at any time ready, for the sake of hurrying on a success, to run the risk of a temporary set-back. And this has been his characteristic professionally as well as politically. It is only proper, at this the conclusion of his political career, to pay this tribute to one who was no mere stop gap, but has all along been regarded in the Eastern provinces as a statesman of high ability and experience—one, indeed, who was one of the first in the counsels of the man whose mantle dropped upon him.

It is much to be regretted that, at this juncture, the premier organ of the Liberal party, the *Toronto Globe*, should have deemed it necessary to make the following observation: "With the fact that Sir John Thompson is a Roman Catholic, we have nothing to do. It would be a poor tribute to the liberality and intelligence of the Canadian people if a rule were laid down that a Roman Catholic may not equally with a Protestant aspire to the highest office within their gift, and any attempt to rouse sectarian prejudice over his appointment will not make for the dignity of politics or the welfare of the country." The *Globe*, no doubt, understands the constituency it is addressing. That constituency—a considerable portion of Ontario Gritdom—is one of its own creation. In fact, until an understanding was arrived at between that paper and Archbishop Lynch, the Protestant horse was ridden almost to death, while, though it had become necessary from a party point of view, it was hardly possible for it to tolerate the French Liberals of Lower Canada. The leaven introduced, years ago, the Liberal organ recognizes as still being to a great extent at work, and, therefore, no doubt, in the interests of its present leader, Mr. Laurier, deems the present a convenient opportunity to say a few words in the way of conciliation.

As for Sir John Thompson, long before he took a seat on the bench of Nova Scotia, he was recognized as a leader of men, and his management of the House of Commons during the incapacitation and subsequent to the death of Sir John A. Macdonald, demonstrated that that opinion had been formed on excellent premises. His advent to power will not likely result in any material change of the policy of the country, though there are numerous modifications of it which a man of physical vigor as well as intellectual power, with an apparently long future before him, may deem it wise to bring before the country with a view to their ultimate adoption. In the first place—but this is hardly a modification ; it might involve an actual revolution—what is to be Canada's ultimate destiny? Is her present, in some respects, semi-independence of the Mother Country—to make way for that enlarged independence of which some people so glibly talk or are our relations with Great Britain to be made closer so as to culminate in that Greater Britain of which the Imperial Federationists not only dream, but are actually working for? Or are we to follow