

our readers some indication of what New Westminster can do in rose cultivation. It is famous for both flowers and fruit, its climate and situation being especially favourable to the growth of both. By and by we hope to present our readers with further demonstration of its success in both these respects.

## THE CLERGY RESERVES QUESTION.

To the Editor of THE DOMINION ILLUSTRATED:

SIR,—In your issue of February 8th Mr. E. J. Hemming charges me with a misstatement of historical facts in regard to the attitude of the French Catholics towards the Protestant Clergy Reserves. To substantiate his position he quotes the division lists upon the final votes, which apparently support his view. It is not safe, however, to base an argument simply upon a vote which the exigencies of politics may force out of a popular assembly. Take for instance the vote of Parliament upon the Irish Question on the 20th April, 1882, by which an address was adopted, without a dissentient voice, advising Her Majesty upon the proper method of governing Ireland; if any person in after years should come upon that vote and conclude anything as to the real sentiments of members upon the subject, he will be very much mistaken. Mr. Hemming has taken a similar surface view of the Clergy Reserve vote.

It is not only a fact recorded in history, but one within the memory of many living men, that the French took no part in the agitation for the secularization of the Clergy Reserves. As Laroque (p. 255, Hist. de Droit) puts it: "La question des réserves ne fut pas directement un sujet de griefs dans le Bas-Canada. Au contraire, dans le Haut-Canada, cette grande question créa des discordes et des jalouses." In the address of Parliament on the subject, in 1850, it is clearly shown as an Upper Canada question in the following passage: "That it appears from the facts above stated, that during a long period of years, and in nine successive sessions of the Provincial Parliament, the representatives of the people of Upper Canada, with an unanimity seldom exhibited in a deliberative body, declared their opposition to religious endowments of the character above referred to." Sir Francis Hincks, who chiefly brought about the secularization, states (p. 43 Religious Endowments in Canada) that "the French Canadians as a party were extremely unwilling to commit themselves on the Clergy Reserve or Rectory questions," and he mentions Sir L. H. Lafontaine, Sir Etienne Taché and Mr. L. H. Viger as being very strongly opposed to the movement.

The following letter will make the matter very clear. Of all the English Governors who have ruled in this country, Lord Elgin was the most able and clear-sighted. The measure was carried while he was Governor, and this is his view of it.

Letter from the Earl of Elgin, Governor-General of Canada, to Earl Grey, Colonial Secretary, dated Toronto, July 12, 1851:—

"As to the insinuation that the movement against the endowments of the Church of England is prompted by the Romans, events will give the lie to it ere long. The following facts, however, seem to be wholly irreconcilable with this hypothesis. Before the union of the Provinces there were very few, if any, Roman Catholic members in the Upper Canada Parliament; they were all powerful in the Lower. Now it is recorded in history that the Upper Canadian Legislative Assembly kept up year after year a series of assaults on the 'Clergy Reserves,' in proof of which, read the narrative part of the Address to Her Majesty on the 'Clergy Reserves' from the Legislative Assembly last year. And it is equally a fact that the Lower Canadian Legislative Assembly never meddled with them, except, I think, once when they were invited to do so by the Government." (Walrond—Letters of Lord Elgin, p. 139.)

Lord Elgin was not in favour of the drastic measures which the Upper Canada majority were urging. His biographer says, p. 135: "So violent was the feeling that it threatened to sweep away at one stroke all the endowments in question, without regard to vested interests, and without even waiting for the repeal of the Imperial Act

"by which these endowments were guaranteed. 'More loyal and moderate counsels however prevailed, owing chiefly to the support which they received from the Roman Catholics of Lower Canada.'"

The Roman bishops never complained of these endowments, nor were any petitions got up nor any agitation raised about them in Lower Canada. It was clearly against the interest of the Roman Church to advocate openly or covertly any principles of secularization.

Lord Elgin's editor, basing his statements on the letters, goes on to say (p. 136): "The more moderate and thoughtful men of every party are said to have been at heart opposed to it, but it was impossible for them to stand against the current of popular feeling. The Bill speedily became law; the Clergy Reserves were handed over to the various Municipal Corporations for secular uses; and though by this means a noble provision made for the sustentation of religion was frittered away so as to produce but few beneficial results, a question which had long been the occasion of much heart-burning was at least settled, and settled for ever. A slender provision for the future was saved out of the wreck by the commutation of the reserved life-interests of incumbents, which laid the foundation of a small permanent endowment; but, with this exception, the equality of destitution among all Protestant communities was complete."

I do not wish to be misunderstood. I have not expressed any opinion as to the merits of the subject, and I shall not go off into any side issue on a dead question. I am merely inquiring as to who broke up the Protestant endowments; and, to adopt the words of the Address of Parliament, I am compelled to say that it was "the great majority of Her Majesty's subjects in Upper Canada, to whom these endowments had been for many years a source of intense dissatisfaction."

The question, however, after a long agitation in Upper Canada, got down into the region of practical politics. Sir Francis Hincks says (p. 73, Religious Endowments): "There had never been any difference of opinion on the Clergy Reserve question among the Upper Canada members of the Government (Lafontaine-Baldwin), but the time had arrived when it was necessary to come to an understanding with the Lower Canadians." The Hincks-Morin Ministry was then formed with the two chief planks in its platform of the Secularization of the Clergy Reserves to please Upper Canada, and the Abolition of the Seigneurial Tenure to satisfy Lower-Canada. It is not necessary to follow in detail the shifting phases of politics which succeeded during the next two years, but at last a coalition Ministry emerged out of chaos bearing with it these same two planks, and in 1854 both measures were carried. Mr. Hemming points out that French Roman Catholics were among the majority which carried it. It is true that their scruples were at last overcome. Let the following extract from Mr. Louis Turcotte's valuable history explain how:—

"Les députés du Bas-Canada supportèrent la mesure ministérielle, afin de se rendre aux désirs de la population du Haut-Canada. M. Cartier (afterwards Sir George) rappela à l'opposition que la sécularisation des réserves n'avait pas été soulevée par les catholiques du Bas-Canada, mais par la grande majorité protestante de l'autre province. C'était à elle qu'il fallait en attribuer la responsabilité. Les dernières élections avaient prouvé que la sécularisation était une idée populaire parmi cette population. Si l'on n'avait pas envoyé une majorité écrasante en faveur de la sécularisation, les catholiques n'auraient pas voté pour la mesure."—Le Canada sous l'Union, p. 231.

From these extracts the true history of the Clergy Reserve secularization clearly appears. I have no wish to renew ancient griefs or revive the memory of sectional quarrels, but the "double majority" theory was then doing its work, and if, after so long and rancorous a struggle in Upper Canada, the French had assisted the minority to bind the Clergy Reserves upon the immense and finally triumphant majority of Protestants, there stood men

ready and waiting to raise the cry of "French Catholic domination"—a cry potent in Upper Canada to arouse a storm before which many a well meaning politician has quailed, before which the Ministry would have been swept away and the abolition of the seigniorial tenure indefinitely postponed. Excepting as a matter of theoretical principle, the French had no interest in thwarting the English in their resolution to secularize the endowments of the Protestant clergy and to abolish all relation between the Protestant Church and the State. They were deeply interested in the abolition of the Seigneurial Tenure, for which the aid of the English vote was necessary, and which did not concern Upper Canada. Both parties were pleased; but, as a Protestant success, it was not brilliant. It is true the preamble was passed "that it is advisable to remove all semblance of connection between Church and State," but then the Act goes on with very deficient logic, to apply its sweeping principle to Protestants alone. Not a voice was then raised to point out that the Roman Catholic Church was established by the very same Imperial Statutes which created a provision for a Protestant clergy, and, now that the Province of Quebec is almost autonomous, it is expected to carry out that advisory preamble from the logical consequences of which the Parliament of Old Canada shrank. When the French Roman Catholics desire to disestablish their own Church they will do so; there is nothing to prevent them; but to do it by resolutions of Protestant assemblies here or in Ontario seems to indicate a deficient sense of humour.

S. E. DAWSON.

Montreal, February 10, 1890.

## IN THE ARENA.

I.

Life's mighty amphitheatre was filled  
With many a fair and many a brutal face,  
As o'er the vast arena to his place  
A Spartan strode, strong-limbed and iron-willed,  
And for a moment the great noise was stilled;  
First came against him Grief, a Greek from Thrace,  
With dagger swift; but soon a bloody trace  
Signed from the sand his enemy was killed;  
Then like a Samnite, waving sword and shield,  
Sorrow fell on him fiercely and was slain;  
Gaunt Misery, a Mirmillonean, steeled,  
Fought and was vanquished; Sin the net in vain  
Threw to ensnare him; all he overcame  
Till thick the air grew with the world's acclaim.

II.

But, lo, a woman at the gate appears  
With jewel'd hair, arm'd only with a dart,  
And at the sight of her with awful start  
The victor pales and trembles; cursing jeers  
Crash through the ample space as o'er the spears  
And swords of his slain foes he bares his heart,  
Crying "Love, spare me, for my life thou art;"  
And she, with shuddering frame, affrighted hears.  
Then, with her weapon poised at his breast  
And mantled eyes, she waits, aware his life,  
If she but look, must be her pity's gift,  
And with a sigh drives home the point well press'd  
To end for him the gladiatorial strife,  
While laughs the world, its mocking thumb uplift.

SARCEPTA.

## FATAL CHRISTMAS INDULGENCE.

Everyone has had occasion from time to time to pity the helpless plight of infants in the charge of drunken parents. Neglect and mismanagement are the least of the dangers which continually surround these poor little creatures, Accident and even death are ever present possibilities which, as the sequel shows, may be very easily realised. Last week no fewer than nine inquests were held by Dr. Macdonald on the bodies of children who had been overlain and suffocated by their intoxicated parents on the nights of Christmas Day and the days before and after it. This kind of accident is, unfortunately, not unusual. Sometimes it has occurred so regularly in a family as to suggest some doubt whether a purpose did not underlie the evident neglect. In most cases, however, the excuse, faulty though it is, of inadvertence must in justice be admitted. Notwithstanding this allowance, the parent's conduct, of course, is far from blameless. We should seriously question whether it is not legally punishable. Granted the accident, its import is materially aggravated by the fact of intoxication, and further by the previous neglect in failing to provide what the poorest household may easily obtain—a separate sleeping crib of simple structure for the infant. The chief lesson to be learnt from this Christmas catalogue of avoidable deaths, indeed, is that the general introduction of this excellent preventive arrangement is highly advisable for the reason above suggested, and probably also for others besides.—*Lancet*.