

been thought safer to have a separate seminary for Canadians. In elections the clergy have exerted a strong pressure in the past and will do so again. The Church is, as always, a firm friend of the Imperial connexion, being persuaded that under the United States she would lose her semi-establishment. In the schools she is determined to retain full control over Roman Catholic children. In the Province of Quebec nearly half the teachers belong to religious orders (1499 men and 2832 women), and these are not required to have any diploma. Among the Protestants the religious instruction given in the schools is generally non-sectarian. M. Siegfried gives a good account of the school question in Manitoba and in the new provinces, and a rapid view of the institutions of higher learning.

The following dialogue between M. Siegfried and a Jesuit professor of philosophy at Winnipeg is interesting:

Q. Do you teach philosophy in Latin? A. Certainly it is the custom.

Q. What philosophy do you teach? A. Aristotle and St. Thomas.

Q. Do you not also give a place to more modern philosophers such as Descartes and Spinoza? A. Yes, we speak of them to refute them: they are contrary to the doctrines of the Church.

The author speaks with appreciation of McGill and of Toronto University, especially as schools of practical science. "If French education does not revise its methods," he says, "we shall see McGill become for Laval and for our whole race a more dangerous adversary than an army equipped with the most modern rifles."

As regards Great Britain, the French-Canadians are entirely contented with the *status quo*. They are loyal but without affection. Their attachment to France has no political significance. The French Revolution divides them from modern France almost as much as does the Atlantic. The idea of annexation with the United States has no charm for the French-Canadian. His separate nationality would go by the