

good treatises and experienced authorities upon the subject, and then give the public the results of their reading and enquiry in the columns of this journal.

In pursuing such a course of study they may haply learn something of the classification of trees—their species and genera and localities; of the organization of a forester's staff, and their annual duties; of all the exactnesses of thinning out; of the prevention of fires in the woods, and their extinction by water and sand-belts and trenching and axe-work; of the system and mode of life of timber-making parties and purveying for the same; of restrictions upon the use of the forest by outsiders to avoid fires; of relations with Indian tribes; of new and profitable applications for timber, including small timber and culls. And so, not to weary the reader, we leave this question for the present.

The New York *Times* is asking whether we should say "Railway" or "Railroad." "Railway," beyond a doubt! In the matter of the sense of the root-words, the question seems scarcely worth a thought or a quibble, and this, if so concluded, will relegate the entire query to one of sound. But there is really no question here. "Railway" is incomparably superior, as avoiding the duplicate ripple. Ask our "exquisite" friend, and he will declare that it is "vevy pwefwable."

To ventilate sewage pipes through openings on the surface of the streets is doubtless a great error, and there can be no good reason for it in any case, for the ventilating pipes can be carried above the houses as high as we wish, unless we desire to have them put to a double service and made to perform the part of drainage shafts for the rain-water. We are not at all bound to do this, and it seems that consideration ought to be conclusive as to the importance of adopting the high-escape system in our Canadian cities.

A correspondent writes:—

It was a generous thought of the founder of the SPECTATOR that opportunity should be provided for every citizen to express himself in the columns of the paper over his own designation, but he had been then hardly long enough amongst us to be aware that it is one of the peculiar attributes of a new society that no man can be said to be valued for what he is, in mind or disposition, unless his powers be enhanced by money or position, or a European or continental recognition, or a political or society office, or a clerical or college diploma, which are doubtless all good things in themselves, but not intended to have quite so much exclusive power connected with them. We are a young society. We do not presume to judge for ourselves. But better times are perhaps coming to the Dominion, and even now the unknown or little known can sometimes reckon up the partial fruits of their labours for the people, and be enabled to despise the machinations of his contemptible foes.

SIR,—As my name has been made the subject of considerable comment lately, and as my scheme has been ridiculed during the late Toronto election, and as you have seen fit in your independent journal to discuss the proposed canal, I would desire in self-defence to enlighten your readers upon the point in question. As far as the question of twenty years hence is concerned being time enough to think of constructing the Huron and Ontario Ship Canal, I would call attention to the report of the *Globe* of the 28th June, 1848, of a public meeting held in Toronto for the construction of the now called Northern Railroad. Mr. C. S. Gzowski in his speech on that occasion stated that plank and macadamized roads would be sufficient for Canada for the next 30 years, and that it was insanity and weakness in any one to think of railroads. I would like to mention, in extenuation of the scheme, that over 200,000 petitioners petitioned for the construction of the canal. To my mind it is now neither more nor less than a question of location is concerned, Belleville versus Toronto. Either we are to have a ditch for barges, to all intent and purposes practically worthless, or we are to have one of the finest water communications in the world improved by art.

Respectfully yours,

Toronto, Sept. 7th, 1880.

Fred. C. Capriol.

The Baroness Burdett-Coutts has had the decency to fall sick at last, and the marriage with her juvenile friend is postponed in consequence. It is to be hoped that the sober reflection of a sick bed

will bring the aged lady to a sound mind. In her normal mental condition she is a most estimable woman, who has lived a long life of great usefulness, and it would be a pity for that career to end in a craze—a pity for the old lady herself and a pity for young Mr. Bartlett.

It is very entertaining to hear the remarks of the London swell-mob on the iniquity of being kept in the town during August—sacred to holidays by the sea, or the lofty enjoyment of grouse shooting. Mr. Gladstone and his Government could hardly have perpetrated a worse crime—it is much more execrated than the abused and abolished Irish disturbance Bill, and will probably be remembered against him as one of the crowning sins of a life already weighed down with sins innumerable. Say the dainty politicians—who have more concern for partridges and grouse than for those popular emergencies which come be it summer or winter, never consulting the almanac—"why should we be robbed of our shooting, or our month by the sea? This is monstrous and ought to be put down by act of parliament."

But to serious minded men this governmental determination to accomplish a fair and urgently necessary portion of its original programme, undeterred by the too frequent babblings of half serious and wholly stupid obstructionists, is magnificent. It marks a new era in political life, and warns present politicians, and politicians expectant, that when they give themselves to the service of the country it may actually be *service*—working hard and late in heat and moisture when less self-sacrificing men are plodding the moors after sport.

But while the Government have been working with a will to deserve the respect and confidence of the country, bringing forward wholesome measures of reform, the Lords who hold dignified council in the Upper House have been doing the kind of work which was certain to provoke the question: "Is the House of Lords of any real service to the country?" Whether the Government acted with due caution in introducing Mr. Forster's measure for preventing useless and cruel evictions in Ireland during the period of the present distress, may be fairly questioned; but when it had passed the House of Commons it should have been allowed to become law. All the mischief that could possibly arise from it was then done, while the good it was calculated to achieve was effectually hindered. Irish agitators found it easy to raise the cry once more: "Ireland cannot get justice from England by fair means, and had better resort to foul." Every treasonable speech and every agrarian outrage in Ireland now will be charged upon the House of Lords by all those who wish to bring charges against them, and the fact that when called upon to pass a measure affecting their own landlord class they talked and voted entirely in their own interests will be remembered in the not far-off days when the question of abolishing their House altogether will become a subject for popular discussion. Add to that the unseemly manner in which the Voters' Registration Bill was kicked by lordly boots out of existence, and the sum total is clearly one the Lords have no reason to be proud of.

A sigh of relief was the first welcome given to the tidings that General Roberts had defeated Ayooob Khan and broken up his army. For months the country had been kept in a state of profound anxiety. We were engaged in a struggle with a fierce and warlike people, led by a man not at all unskilful in the ruder science of war. The Jingoism in England and India, who howled so fiercely for a bloody revenge when Major Cavagnari was murdered, were almost silenced when tidings of the defeat of General Burrows were received. The situation was grave and perplexing in the extreme; the trouble was self-inflicted; all began to wish that the war had never been entered upon, but none denied that retreat after such a disaster was impossible. General Roberts has changed the situation, vindicated the honour and glory of British arms in the East, and made it possible for England to cease residence and interference in Afghanistan. The war was unrighteous, it has been carried on in great part in a manner creditable neither to the generosity nor courage of the army, and the victory just won by General Roberts is welcome, not only because the battle was fought in true British style, but because it leaves no need for any more of the sort.

EDITOR.