

hangers-on, office-seekers, party whips and hacks, street vendors, etc., etc., could certainly not be matched on earth, if anywhere else.

There seemed but one common universal trait, viz.: smoking, but chiefly chewing, tobacco. Faces, opinions, dress, aims, dialects, etc., might be as varied as the persons, from the most manly face of a Senator, as Wade Hampton or Samar, to the thinnest remove from the baboon fraternity, of the features of a Texan bush-ranger, or the wild man of the western plains, or a limber down-easter, yet all agreed in the "chew" perpetual.

As to the flow of the juice of the "weed" it might be written:

"Men may come and men may go,
But it goes on forever."

In the South smoking and chewing are indulged in as a habit or rule in the parlours of the first families, in presence of the ladies. Spittoons are placed everywhere, in the pulpit and pews.

It is a common remark that the Democracy has a respectable *And*—the leading men North and South—but a slimy *tell*, i.e., Kelly and his Tammany Hall following.

St. Louis is a busy, smoky, hot city, like Cincinnati. It rivals Chicago in air. From St. Louis to Kansas City, both in Missouri, the prairie farms are peerless.

The country, though beautiful, becomes monotonous as you pass along a dead level all day. Kansas City, 57,000 population, is a very lively place, of only a few years growth.

From it to this city is 639 miles, over prairie, partly cultivated, part not; some of the latter has grass; 100 miles or so is barren. What a strange sight! Trackless level, bounded by horizon, as the ocean; blanner than the sky, hardly a blade of grass or weed visible; sand—hard sand—now and then a few antelopes appear. This is a deer-like goat or goat-like deer, very swift of foot—can outrun the train, as a couple of them did one day for a mile or two. The railroad stations are far apart. At these there are usually a few hovels in the ground like a "root house" in Canada. The roof is slightly above ground, size about 8x10 feet. Others are built of sods or clay above ground. A family lives in each of these. All on the train rushed out to peep into one of these lowly domiciles. The youngsters fled like rabbits to their holes. The antelope furnishes excellent food. On the grassy plains vast herds of cattle, of, perhaps, 1,000 or more in a drove, are seen along the way, with men on horse-back guarding them. On the level the railway ties are laid on the sand. The train moves as smoothly as if on ice, without roll, jolt or jar. Horton chairs and Pullman coaches reduce the annoyances of travel to a minimum.

Sharps, "confidence" men and women in collusion, infest all trains west of Kansas City. The conductors and porters are believed to be in league with them and share the spoils.

There is not space to describe our first glimpse of the Rocky Mountains. As the train swept along the vast plateau—5,000 feet above sea—towards Denver a thunder storm added a terrific grandeur to the already sublime spectacle. The far-seen flashes of lightning played around the myriad peaks whose summits mingle with and look like huge piles of clouds, while the foot-hills and city lie beneath and nearer to us. These mountains differ from the Alps or any others yet seen. They are higher, larger, rounded off, rocky, vaster, piled up like wool or clouds on one another, as if the gods had rolled "Pelion on Ossa." First the vast plateau, then the foot-hills, then higher and higher and higher ranges and peaks apparently *ad infinitum*. The Alps start up steep to sharp peaks from the base.

This beautiful Paris-like city and Italian air and climate must be left to another time. Both are peerless in America. Lest this may seem overdrawn, take a sentence of the noted correspondent of the New York "Herald," J. Russell Young. He says, "Denver and Paris are the two cities with which I fell in love at first sight, and in which I have a constant yearning some time or other to reside. I have seen no prettier town in Europe or America than your same Denver."

It was settled in 1859, population 36,000, seven railroads, seven banks; four daily, six weekly, newspapers; twenty-five churches, seven fine school buildings, street cars, gas works and water works. \$25,000,000 trade annually. The foot-hills are twelve miles off, Snowy Range fifty. The streets are eighty feet wide, avenues one hundred. Two at least of the hotels are equal to any on the continent. The people greatly "mixed." More anon.

Denver, July 1st, 1880.

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY AND DIVORCE.

MR. EDITOR,—The discussion of the divorce case before the General Assembly, your own able article, and that of the Toronto "Globe," I read with interest. I am unable to understand, however, how so much interest was excited, and sympathy evoked, and eloquence and legal learning expended in this instance when a case of much greater hardship fell flat on the Assembly of 1878. Mr. Duncan Sinclair, D.L.S., memorialized the Assembly of that year, reciting a story of great hardship, and asking that venerable body—in view of the difficulty, expense and uncertainty attending suing for a divorce, under the present law, and in so large a country, with a court so constituted as the Senate is, even when the divorce is sought on Scriptural grounds—to take steps to petition Parliament to pass a law establishing a divorce court in each of the Provinces of the Dominion, so that the obtaining of a divorce for sufficient cause might not be the luxury of the rich but the right of all citizens. Mr. Sinclair asked no change in the law as to the grounds on which a divorce was to be sought. He is thoroughly Presbyterian, and at one with the Confession of Faith in that respect. How was he treated?

Mr. Sinclair's case is simply this: Mr. Sinclair came to Manitoba in 1870. Winnipeg at that time afforded few places, indeed, where one could board with any degree of comfort. Mr. H. J. Clarke, then Attorney-General of Manitoba, asked, as a great favour, to be permitted to board with Mr. Sinclair. Mr. Clarke was at the time married, but his wife, I believe, was in Montreal. She is yet living, and generally spends the summer in Winnipeg. Mr. Sinclair acceded to Mr. Clarke's urgent request. Mr. Clarke repaid his friend's kindness by endeavouring to alienate from him the affections of his wife. Mr. Sinclair being frequently away from home did not discover Mr. Clarke's perfidy till too late. The guilty pair took advantage of Mr. Sinclair's absence in the west on business and left Winnipeg, Mrs. Sinclair leaving behind three children, one of whom was quite young and delicate. Mr. Clarke and his paramour went to the eastern provinces and afterwards to California, where they lived in style on money obtained, it is said, not too honourably or honestly by Mr. Clarke while acting as Attorney-General here. Mr. Sinclair wished to take proceedings at once to secure a regular release from a woman who had proved so faithless to him. But to hire a detective to follow the guilty wife and secure in the east and in the United States the requisite evidence to criminate her and enable him to succeed before the peculiar court at Ottawa required a long purse and a full one. This Mr. Sinclair did not think he possessed. He had, moreover, his children to support and educate. He consequently did nothing.

About three years ago the notorious couple returned to the city of their former exploits, and Mr. Sinclair finds himself living in the same city with a woman, legally his wife, while she is living with another man. These people (who are here ostracised from respectable society) appear to glory in their shame and lose no opportunity, I am told, of annoying and wounding the man whom they have wronged. And were Mr. Sinclair to die to-morrow this woman could claim, and no doubt would obtain, her share of his property. Now, when this case was brought before the Assembly two years ago they could give it no consideration, in fact, dismissed it with scant courtesy, as if a wrong was done in submitting it. The case of the lady this year has been made a *cause celebre*. Grave professors who are never accused of losing their balance easily, offer to defray expenses out of their own pockets should a divorce be sought in the right quarter, and on the correct plea. Why this difference? Had Mr. Sinclair sought and obtained a divorce in the United States and married again would he be listened to with more respect? It would seem so. Are not her children the same to the Church whether male or female, whether approaching her General Assembly in 1878, or 1880. I for one protest against the apparent discrimination. Mr. Sinclair sought no divorce because he felt himself unable to bear the expense, and is now living under circumstances to evoke sympathy. Those of us here who know the hardship of his case sympathized with him at the time, and now all the more in view of the contrast (no doubt, you say, unintentional) between the Assembly's treatment of him and Mrs. Phillips. Can justice yet be done in this matter?

Winnipeg, July 1st, 1880.

IMPARTIALITY.

OUR YOUNG PEOPLE.

"Instead of thy fathers shall be thy children whom thou mayest make princes in all the earth" (Ps. lxx. 16). There has been a correspondence lately in the columns of THE PRESBYTERIAN regarding our young people as to how we are to hold them or keep them in our communion.

Now, without examining in detail the many plans which have been or might be suggested, I would simply ask, Are the young people to ruin the Church or is the Church to teach, train, and rule the young people?

I will not yield to any one in my estimate of the value of our young people, but when I find these inexperienced youths constantly suggesting changes in the management or worship of the congregation, and when every Sabbath the minister, who may be in other respects a most estimable man, has some change to announce, and, it may be, give the reason that it is to please or attract our young people, I think it time to put the question, Who is to rule?

If the children are to be taken to fill the places of the fathers, it is of the greatest importance that they should be taught not only the Scriptural lessons in the Sabbath school, or to arrange a bouquet of flowers on the platform or appreciate how well the choir "done that piece," but they should be taught the great principles of our system, her simple form of worship, and to love Presbyterianism for the testimony which she has borne, and is bearing, to apostolic truth, and that instead of our system being changed to meet their views, they should be taught to join in with the system. And how is this to be done? I would say principally by pastoral and parental instruction.

Ministers have much in their hands in moulding the minds of the young. If they are known or heard to speak lightly of our system, the young will be readily alienated. Some ministers are a little ahead of our quiet old-fashioned ways, and young people at once snatch at the idea, and one and another urge on the minister the importance of their views until they succeed in convincing him that the old people are really only in the way, that they are fogies and obstacles to progress, especially after their fashion, and at last the minister, not unfrequently to the offence of much older and more matured Christians, yields to the wishes of the younger disciples or it may be lambs, and so they are gratified this time. This only prepares them for going further the next time.

Or it may be the minister has been heard to give his preference for hymns instead of Psalms, and if the young people don't get hymns they go to another denomination. No doubt the matter of praise has much to do with making church attractive, and whilst I think we should give God the best we can, still this can be done without making the impression on young people that Presbyterian worship is either antiquated or fossilized.

Parents can do much in this matter to train their children to reverence our system, and, without bigotry, to prefer it to that of any other; and if with solid instructions from the pulpit and in Bible class, parents do their duty in this respect then may we expect a fulfilment of the golden text at the head of this paper, "Instead of thy fathers shall be thy children whom thou mayest make princes in all the earth."

Toronto, 5th July.

PRESBYTERIAN.

CANON FARRAR recently preached a sermon in Westminster Abbey on "Religion and Politics," in which he said: "If ever through the fault or feebleness of us, the clergy, Englishmen begin to regard religion as a sort of conventional theory, as a set of abstract dogmas, as a mixture of party watchwords and decent observance, if ever we drive men to the disastrous conclusion that religious exhortations have little concern with political and social life, that they may do for churches, but have no connection with the shop or office; that they may do for Sunday, but are unworkable on ordinary days; that they may concern the clergy and their adherents, but have little to say to the city or to the nation; whenever, in fact, the religious and the secular are regarded as two distinct and separate spheres, and the truths of religion as a set of phrases current among the elect, but meaningless to the vast masses of unregenerated mankind—then farewell to the true power and glory of the Christian faith."