

and alms-giving becomes a mere selfish desire to rid ourselves for the moment of the annoyance, instead of that

"Holy Supper kept indeed  
In whatso we share with another's need;  
Not what we give, but what we share,  
For the gift without the giver is bare;  
Who gives himself with his alms feeds three,  
Himself, his hungering neighbour, and Me."

One of the courtiers of Charles II., said of him, "Nothing so much delighted him as a bewitching pleasure called sauntering, and the royal idler was not the last of the race."

These of whom we speak, under guise of buying and selling, even of poverty, *delight* in this life and will do nothing else.

Under guise of poverty we say? Are they not really poor, then?

Doubtless, friend, but why?

Because they will not give persevering effort to living in any better way. Routine is hateful to them and they would rather suffer in idleness for three days, so long as some such contriving on the fourth will keep them from actual starvation.

And yet we are often struck with the old question, "Did this man sin or his parents?"

We can scarcely realize the lack of bodily training to the neglected children of the very poor, which among us makes the doing of regular work comparatively easy, we, whose training began when our smiling mother held us in her arms and taught our baby fingers to grasp a shining rattle.

Far less can we appreciate the dark mind and stunted moral sense which leave no conscience higher than fear of the "peeler,"—no law to self but the demands of the animal.

But

"It is not ours to separate  
This tangled skein of will and fate,  
To show what metes and bounds should stand  
Upon the soul's debatable land,  
And between choice and Providence  
Divide the circle of events."

Yet in most civilised countries when a man is incapable of taking care of himself, or is liable to injure his neighbour, the state or community to which he belongs takes charge of him. The gospel of political economists and philanthropists is "the greatest good of the greatest number," and assuredly upon that principle, something needs to be done in our cities to put an end to the annoyance caused by the excessive number of vagrants, who, as Dr. Johnson remarked of a certain Mr. Lewis, "Sir, he lives in London and hangs loose on society."

Ancient statutes contain severe regulations respecting vagrancy.

In the reign of Henry VIII., a vagrant after being whipped, was required to take "an oath to return to his native place there for three years to labour as a true man ought to do." Those convicted a second time were liable not only to whipping, but to have the upper part of the right ear cut off.

By a statute of Edward VI., a vagabond was marked with a V on the breast, with a hot iron, and adjudged to be a slave for two years to the person who took him; kept on bread and water, and "made to work by beating, chaining, or otherwise, at any vile work soever." If he absented himself for fourteen days, he was branded on the cheek with an S, and adjudged to be a slave forever.

Under Queen Elizabeth, a second offence was punishable by death, and notwithstanding the penchant which Charles II., himself possessed for "idle wanderings," vagrants during his reign were transported.

In the time of George II., beggars were hardly dealt with, and more than all, any person harbouring a vagrant was subject to a fine of forty shillings.

In later days, while whipping and mutilation is abolished in England, effective means are employed to keep down that class of beggars which is so numerous and troublesome in this newer civilisation.

In France, the statute of 1767 under Louis XV., dealt severely with all vagabonds, describing as such all "gens sans aven; les gens qui n'ont ni profession ni m tier, ni domicile certain, et qui n'ayont aucun bien pour subsister, ne peuvent faire certifier de leur vie et moeurs par personnes digne de foi."

Now, you may walk the length of Paris without a glimpse of a beggar, except on New Year's Day, when alone they may crawl out of their holes into the broad sunlight, to be known as beggars and appeal to you for charity.

How much of good and how much of ill lies behind the enforcement of such stern laws, we have not now space to discuss.

Like the sunlight, they fall alike upon the just and the unjust, and without doubt, in individual cases unnecessary pain is inflicted, for the law makers are not yet wise enough to make laws for the masses, which will not sometimes bear harshly upon the individual.

Finally, brethren, it would almost seem that our tender mercies were like those of the wicked—altogether cruel.

That we forget the gaunt wolves whining at the door, or the little and weak ones with

\* \* \* "their faces pinched and blue,  
Hiding from those sisters two—  
Hunger and Cold."

Alas! for them. Our souls ache and throb with the pain and sorrow of it.

But the question is just this: does the permitting in a community of this vagrant class result in the least mitigation of poverty and suffering, or, on the contrary, does it not foster habits of idleness and vagabondism in a much larger number of persons than the allowing of the nuisance can possibly benefit?

A. E. LYMAN.

## THE STORY OF THE OKA INDIANS.

### III.

#### THE DEEDS OF CONCESSION AND RATIFICATION.

(Continued.)

To one whose source of information on this subject was confined to the "Historical Notice" issued by the Seminary in 1876, under the signatures of the Director of the Mission at Oka, and its advocate, the pretensions there set forth would appear to be honestly and legally maintained, and the Indians of Oka convicted as squatters at the Lake of Two Mountains, having sold their Roman birthright for a mess of Protestant pottage, and meriting a stigma as the Ishmaelites, instead of the wards of the Government.

When we find gentlemen, such as those who have in that pamphlet undertaken the defence of the Seminary, guilty of the most unblushing misquotation,—of which I propose to prove—it is no surprise that any of their statements in this matter should be regarded with suspicion. No plea of ignorance can be offered to exonerate these gentlemen from the above charge, as they have special facilities for procuring all deeds and documents bearing upon the case, and do not speak for themselves, but as the mouthpieces of a corporation whose "rights" have been contested so often, that their arguments ought by this time to have become perfect by reiteration.

In my last paper I gave a full translation of the Deed of Ratification of 1718, and charged the Seminary in its "Historical Notice" with quoting this Deed, as a certain gentleman is said to quote Scripture *for his purpose*. For the future it would be wiser for the Seminary to furnish less employment for the ingenuity of Messrs. Lacan and Prevost, and so avoid the mortification of exposure.

As seen previously, the Seminary petitioned the King of France for the Seignory of the Lake *not for its own advantage*, but in the words of the deed, "that it would be *to the advantage of the Mission of Indians* at the Sault au Recollet." All the obligations it assumed, were so assumed in reference to the Indians. The King accedes to the request. He grants lands, constituting the Seminary Seignors, *with all the rights, privileges and responsibilities of such*. He makes certain reservations in favour of the Crown; imposing certain obligations upon the Seminary.

Chap. I. of the "Historical Notice" quotes the Titles with the following slight omissions:—

1. The fact that the concession was "to the ecclesiastics of the Seminary of St Sulpice established at Paris, from whom those of the Seminary of St. Sulpice established at Montreal proceed" is throughout carefully concealed. Not a word is said about the Seminary in France, for reasons which I will deal with in another paper; while the fact that the ordinance of 1841 named it as that "of Montreal" is italicized. The deed of ratification reads thus: "has given and granted to the ecclesiastics of the Seminary of St. Sulpice established at Paris." The "Historical Notice," page 7, reads: "gave and conceded to the ecclesiastics of the Seminary of St. Sulpice, established at Montreal." The importance of the distinction will appear bye and bye.

2. The "Historical Notice" altogether omits the important context, "*solely on the conditions which are to be mentioned in these presents*," and as will be seen further, avoids the very mention of the most important of these conditions.

3. The Seminary special pleaders (page 8) defines the conditions—"that they will, at their own cost, make all necessary outlay for the removal of the said mission, and construct or build, at their own cost, a church and fort of stone for the security of the Indians, according to plans, the said buildings to be finished in two years, etc." By dropping a comma at "church," it is made to appear that the church, as well as the fort, was "for the security of the Indians." The important omission is made, that these plans "shall be by them handed over to the Governor and Intendant of La Nouvelle France, to be by them and with their report sent to the Council of Marine for His Majesty's information, and to be approved." The evidence of *Trusteeship* is here very plainly seen. When the King of France conceded Seignories to his civil or military officers, as their absolute property, no such restrictions were made, but permission given them to dispose of them for their own emolument. But here, and all through the Deed, the conditions and obligations are such as would never have been accepted by a body who asked for, wanted and expected to get the concession as its absolute property.

4. The "Historical Notice" mildly states one of its obligations thus:—"On the obligation of fealty and homage," and omits the context, "which the ecclesiastics of the said Seminary, their successors and assigns, shall be held to perform at the Castle of St. Lewis in Quebec, and which they shall hold under the customary duties and dues and agreeably to the custom of the Prevostship and Viscounty of Paris, followed in La Nouvelle France," etc. No sort of exemption is here evident.

5. The Historical Notice cites another obligation imposed upon the Seminary, thus:—"Of residing or causing to reside (*tenir feu et lieu*) on the said concession." This might be inferred as meaning that the Seminary alone are obliged to "reside or cause to reside" on the Seignory; but the Deed says, "*They shall keep and cause to be kept house and home (feu et lieu) on the said concession*," and means a very important obligation, which it has by no means fully or fairly fulfilled, and which indeed, it has resisted by force when the Indians, in whose interests the lands were given, attempted even to cut wood on the Seignory to repair the miserable "houses" and homes they possess. The "Historical Notice" implies that only the "residence" of the Seminary is compulsory; while the plain interpretation of the Deed as well as common sense will show that it was obliged to erect and keep "house and home" for the Indian families for whose civilization and evangelization it asked and obtained the lands. That this was the interpretation put upon these words in former times is evident from the facts that "houses and homes" for the Indians were built by the Seminary. If evangelization meant a church, and protection, a fort, so

\*An Historical Notice on the difficulties arisen between the Seminary of St. Sulpice of Montreal, and certain Indians of Oka, Lake of Two Mountains. A mere case of Right of Property. By no means a religious question. 2nd Edition, 1876.

"Sir," said a blustering man to a religious opponent, "to what sect do you suppose I belong?" "Well, I don't exactly know," replied his opponent, "but to judge from your size, appearance, and constant buzzing, I should think you belonged to the class generally called insect."