

sion. The legislature is in session; he goes to its place of meeting, and, standing in the corridor, watches the ever-shifting crowd. Here, again, priests mingle in the throng: if there be a measure that interests their Church they are in committee-room and in the galleries of the House. He calls on members of the cabinet, in their ante-rooms, he finds priests or meets them leaving his private room, and wherever they go observes how their opinions are deferred to, their requests granted. Attending the meeting of the City Council he finds like obsequiousness to the requests that come from the archbishop's palace. The Church of Rome owns a third of the real estate of the city, and, therefore, ought to be its largest taxpayer. It pays no tax, yet is insistent on being granted favors at the expense of those who do.

Standing whether in country or city, in presence of conditions so extraordinary, so utterly opposite to what prevail in every other Province of the Dominion, two questions press for answer:

1. How has this come about?
2. Is not the existence of such conditions in a Province that elects sixty-five members of the House of Commons, a menace to the Dominion's continuing to be British in reality, and to its people enjoying free institutions?

CONDITIONS NOT A SURVIVAL OF FRENCH RULE

If you ask a Roman Catholic he assures you what you see is a survival of the French period, that the French, under British rule, in their love of Romanism, have preserved it in every detail as their fathers knew it before the Conquest. Is this true? Is it really so, that the Church of Rome, as it exists to-day in Quebec, is only enjoying the privileges, immunities, and prerogatives it did before Canada became a British possession? This question has a most important bearing on what course our rulers should take with regard to the Church of Rome in Quebec. If it can be proved that Church is only enjoying what was its use-and-wont under the French kings, respect for vested privileges makes the