

But then Mr. Green told us in the same sermon that, being Scotchmen, they must admit that "facts are things that winna ding, and mauna be disputit." Was the "fact" in this case that the money had gone on the arch and the ball?

But to the minds of many the most painful part of the whole proceedings was that which related to the Sabbath services. That day at least should have been left to the newcomers as sacred to thought of God and manhood's life that is apart from all officialdom. But the indecent haste to secure the attendance of the Marquis and Her Royal Highness at church on Sunday which sent an invitation by telegraph—the deputation—the announcement in the newspapers—the "Show your tickets" of the police in charge of the doors—the audience rising to its feet to honour those who in that house and before that altar were but fellow-sinners and fellow-worshippers—the gorgeously draped pews—the new Prayer Books so grandly bound—the large staff of officiating clergymen, and the prolonged service, all formed a most pitiful and painful episode. Let us have enthusiastic loyalty—as much shouting in the streets as we can get up; but, gentlemen, the Sabbath—even in Montreal—should be devoted to the worship of the Lord of Heaven, and not to sinful man, though he be an aristocrat, and the husband of the Princess Louise, and the Governor-General of our Dominion. Read the Epistle of St. James in the light of last Sabbath's flunkeyism; read the story of Christ's dealings with the high and mighty of His time; or, for the matter of that, read the sermon which the Bishop elect preached on the occasion, and which was admirable in tone, and which in the intense earnestness and meek piety displayed must have been a terrific rebuke to those who had gone to the house in a spirit to worship their fellow-mortals.

*Memento mori.* There are some queer people in this world. A friend tells me that on the night of the illumination, when all the world was jostling all the rest of the world—that is, the Montreal world, which in its own estimation is not small—and craning its neck to look at very costly but very monotonous decorations, he saw a man and wife, rustic, not long married, spell-bound in front of the window of a—coffin shop.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

SIR,—I have carefully noted your remarks in reference to certain statements made by me at a meeting of the Finance Committee. I admit the language I used was strong. I thought then, and I do now, that it was necessary that public men have at times to both say and do things that are not only unpleasant to themselves, but seem very unreasonable to those who do not know the circumstances.

I do not like Corporation Investigations; in my memory their odor is bad—as far as I know they do two things—first, they afford an opportunity for venting private spleen; secondly, they usually end by a general whitewashing. If I had time, and could get a competent committee, free from religious, national or sectional prejudice, I might, perhaps, accomplish some good by an investigation. At present, however, it is impossible. I am at the City Hall now almost every day, sometimes going down at 10 a.m., and several times within the last two weeks I have come away with Mr. Robb, City Auditor, at 6 p.m. I am associated with Mr. Melancon, and we are examining all arrears due the city; some of those go back for 20 years and odd; in many cases there are disputed points, and in hundreds of cases there have been lawsuits, which for one reason and another have been put off. I am making an effort to settle every outstanding claim that can be settled. Citizens of every class have been before us; we try to settle on the basis of equity. The City Attorney and City Auditor report on every case. I think there is a good 6 months' work in the job, but if I live, and am supported, I will put the Arrears Department of city matters on a different basis.

Then, appointed with Mr. Ald. Grenier, and Mr. Ald. Childs, I am working on the foot-path dispute question. Many citizens have good cause of complaint for charges made against them in re foot-paths. Our committee purposes examining each claim and settling upon the merits, as the law is evidently arbitrary, and under its sanction very great injustice could be done.

The above duties are extra to my ordinary ones as an alderman, and they are a tremendous tax on my time and brain. I was induced to take hold of them because many of our best citizens applied to me to see if I could not obtain justice for them; in order to do this one must hear both sides of the question. Now, my dear Mr. Editor, I think on the whole that I am doing better work for the citizens in my present course than if I were to take up the investigation business.

WM. CLENDINNENG.

Montreal, Nov. 27th, 1878.

That is all very well so far as it goes, but to my thinking it is not satisfactory. Statements involving serious charges against men's personal reputation should not be made unless he who prefers the charges is prepared to bring proof. I believe Ald. Clendinneng is a good business man, and that he is working hard in the Corporation on behalf of the city; but then, personal character is not a thing that even public men can afford to hold in small esteem. It too frequently happens among us that a man's private character is thoughtlessly assailed, and it is quite time to learn the value of individual rights. There is no need for the Alderman to be at the head of an Investigation Committee; he should not even be on that Committee, but appear before it to give evidence. I still hold that Mr. Clendinneng is in

honour and justice bound to follow up his charges or withdraw them. Mr. G. W. Stephens has challenged him to produce proof; the challenge must be accepted, or Mr. Clendinneng will allow public judgment on himself to go by default.

It is hardly within the range of reasonable dispute that the flagstone contract—whether the price was moderate or not—was a wasteful and extravagant proceeding. Not only were good foot-paths replaced, but miles of unnecessary flagging was done, and some of the stone is now lying in large quantities about the streets unused—like Mr. Mackenzie's steel rails. When public money is spent unnecessarily, it of course suggests that somebody has had a profitable contract. The Mayor's strictures on the City Auditor and Treasurer were imbecile, and would suggest softening of the brain if we didn't know that such a thing is physically impossible. But there has been wrong doing somewhere; can Mr. Clendinneng tell us where?

The *Church Times*—an English organ of the extreme Ritualistic party in the Church—looks with supreme contempt upon all, or nearly all, the Episcopalians of Canada. It can see no good thing in the denomination, and roundly scoffs at Dean Bond and those who elected him Bishop and those who opposed his election. Here are some specimens of brotherly speech: "It would probably have been difficult to find in the whole Dominion of Canada a man more thoroughly unfitted for the post. Dean Bond is not merely a furious and persecuting bigot, but he is a man of narrow understanding and scanty education." I know but little as to the understanding and education of the Bishop-elect, but I am quite sure that the man who wrote that would be all the better if he had some of Dean Bond's common sense and courtesy and piety of tone. The truth is, the *Church Times* is angry with the Episcopalians—clergy and laity alike—in Canada because Ritualism is neither "high" nor strong, and is not likely to be. The party, of which Provost Whitaker is the head, has gone as far as it will dare to venture; but of it the *Church Times* says: "Such sham and thoroughly un-Catholic High Churchmanship as that represented by Provost Whitaker and his friends has not vitality or strength enough to contend on equal terms with another form of Protestantism which is more in earnest, and so it must go the wall if it will not take up the bolder and honester line of what is called Ritualism." Yes—it has gone "to the wall"; but if it should "take up the bolder and honester line" it would get pitched over the wall—that is the trouble.

President Hayes has issued his message, and the Houses of Congress have entered upon what is hoped to be a short session. But the members of Congress have some important work before them. The Silver law will have to be dealt with, greatly altered, or perhaps repealed altogether. The vexed Greenback question will have to be discussed, and the friends of inflation and believers in the "fiat money" creed—although smarting under the disasters which the late elections brought upon them—will hardly be content to sit in silence while a law is passed to redeem and then cancel every greenback. There is the matter of the election frauds and violence in the Southern States to be discussed also, which will lead to the difficult and dangerous "Southern question." The general demand that some change be made in the Navigation laws—so as to admit to registration any vessel, whether built or bought in the United States or anywhere else—cannot well be ignored. Add to all these the question of Custom House duties and patronage, which it is rumoured will come before it, and it is difficult to see how the members of Congress can hope for a short session—unless they are prepared to work a miracle upon themselves in the matter of putting restraint upon their own tongues.

In Great Britain they cannot see the end of their troubles yet. The little war with the Afghans has gone on briskly enough. It can hardly bring glory to Britain if it end where it has begun, that is with the Afghans. But not many believe it will end there. Russia has given proof that she does not want another war just yet, but it seems certain that England cannot hope to have things all her own way in Afghanistan. If to punish the Ameer is all that is sought after by this war, there will be no occasion for Russia's interference; but if that is to be succeeded by a scientific carving of the "haphazard frontiers," then it looks as if Russia will have at least reasonable excuse for taking action.

The gravity of the position impressed all the members of the Cabinet except the Earl of Beaconsfield, who was anxious to carry on, and extend, his personal government. But in spite of the Prime Minister's opinion, Parliament has been called together to discuss the situation, and the discussion is likely to be more than ordinarily hot and strong. The old question will be debated once more—how is Russia to be met? with threats and challenges, or in an amicable and generous way? All are agreed as to the end—all are anxious to secure "British interests," but the manner of the thing is what they cannot agree about.

EDITOR.