

nion expenditure—gratifying, that is, if it should be verified by the event. There was a deficit of \$1,900,000, but according to the Budget, after deducting the expenditure for exceptional purpose, there only remains a comparatively moderate sum which may be overcome by the retrenchment already made or to be made during the current half-year. It appears, turning to the other side of the ledger, that the receipts for the latter half of 1876 were about equal to those of the preceding year, and, assuming the same result for the first half of 1877, Mr. Cartwright thinks that there may be no considerable deficit this year. But is he entitled to make that assumption? He admits that the bad harvest has falsified the predictions of 1876; but he expects that the natural results of that misfortune will not flow from it. The customs' duties fell off two millions and a half in the last fiscal year, and they only formed the chief item out of a total of eight millions. Is it not almost certain that the spring importations will be still more contracted? Have we not much reason to fear a succession of business failures? And all this with the adverse effects of a bad food supply at the back of them. It appears, therefore, to us that Mr. Cartwright views our trade prospects in too roseate a hue. The alterations in the tariff, 'we are sorry to say, are not made with any view of encouraging our drooping industries. Tea, a necessary of life which we cannot produce ourselves, and which is already costly enough, is burdened with two cents per lb. specific duty; while sugar, which we can refine for ourselves, remains as it was. There is no great objection to the other items; yet we are inclined to think that the coal oil producers will hardly be satisfied with the abolition of the excise duty and the small and inadequate protection of six per cent customs' charge. Of course, malt, ale, and cigars suffer, but we do not see any reason to complain on that score. The Budget, on the whole, was a clear exposition of the finances, and if it should turn out to have been over-sanguine, people will be grateful even for illusory comfort in these pinching times.

The debate on the Address, which was exceedingly tame, was concluded in an afternoon. Mr. Guthrie, the new member for South Wellington, the mover, acquitted

himself with great credit, in a maiden speech which argued well for his future success in Parliamentary life. Sir John Macdonald's reply was as lively as possible under the circumstances, yet he scarcely attained to Mark Tapley's standard of jollity. Nothing was said about the great Conservative reaction of which so much has been urged in the Opposition press. There was no spark of exultation in the ex-Premier's speech, no glimmering of sunshine upon his face, such as usually radiates from the countenance of him who has begun to hope. No amendment was proposed to the Address, but the Premier agreed to alter the phraseology of the clause which agreed with His Excellency, that some of the public works contemplated in 1867 should not be undertaken or 'pressed to completion at present.' Mr. Mackenzie's speech was short and incisive; but having no particular summons to the fray, he wisely reserved his heavy artillery. The usual explanations of Ministerial changes were given, and the debate, if such it may be called, was somewhat livelier. Sir John Macdonald roasted M. Cauchon rather severely in his characteristic style, and the President, with helpless meekness, retorted that the Opposition leader 'always would be witty;' but, although the point of Sir John's joke was seen, and perhaps felt, it did not appear to make M. Cauchon merry. On the explanations nothing need be said, for the cause of the changes was known and discussed out of doors long ago. The return of Mr. Roy for Kamouraska by a majority of fifty-one shows that the Hon. Mr. Pelletier acted wisely in retreating upstairs; yet it was hardly kind to make a victim of M. Perrault.

Mr. John Macdonald's motion appointing a committee to consider the desirability of having daily prayers read previous to every sitting, was, in many respects a proper one, and received general support from both sides of the House. Supposing that members of different persuasions can be brought to agree upon the form to be used, there ought to be no objection to a public recognition of the Divine power and goodness, and a humble supplication for Divine guidance and blessing. That prayer should be offered in the Senate, where age has tempered the fury of unruly passion, and not in the House, where political rancour is too