

Galligan yielded to their ontreaties and reluctantly took the coat again. He turned the pockets inside out—he found nothing; he turned the label in the inside of the collar, and read, embroidered in white silk on the reverse of it, "J.L."

Ho had no doubt now that it was John Longworthy's coat. After some haggling he paid just half what Isaac asked for it and took it away.

*To be continued.*

### THE TASK OF THE PEACEMAKER.

If we have not already referred to the Hon. Mr. Joly de Lotbiniere's remarkable letter on the Jesuits' Estates question, it is because we hesitated to take any share in a discussion which we have hitherto purposely avoided. The unhappy controversy which, passing the bounds of its original platform, raged last year through the entire Dominion, was to us, as to many of our compatriots, a source of sincere regret. We did not think we were likely to add to the edification of our readers by mingling our voices with the chorus of conflict. What was needed was not more noise but an interval of silence that would give the contestants a chance of asking what it all really meant. There is nothing more easy than to excite a popular clamour. Even when a community is homogeneous in race and creed, design or chance may cause a storm of indignation against some policy, class or interest, which it may require able and patient statesmanship to calm. How much more liable to gusts of popular feeling are populations of a composite character like ours! Here in this fair land Providence has placed side by side the children of two great races—representatives of the three great elements to which the western half of Europe owes its civilization. The nations from which, in different proportions, we derive these elements, are among the greatest in the world. There is no reason why, being thus complex, being able to claim a part in the traditions and literatures of them both, and being a constituent portion of one of them, Canada should not have a destiny worthy of her two-fold origin, why each section of our people should not recognize in the other its essential complement, a fruitful source of strength and grandeur and stability. Certain it is that only on the principle of complete oneness, of perfect and willing co-operation, can we expect to build up on this continent a power that will take rank in the van of civilized nations. A house divided against itself, we know on the best authority, cannot endure. Whatever tends, therefore, to create dissension, to set race against race and creed against creed, in this great French-English Dominion is to be condemned by the patriot, and whoever wilfully encourages division, on whatever plea, is guilty of treason to his country.

It must not, of course, be supposed that on great questions of policy it is possible to avoid divergence of view. All progress, all reform involves more or less of political conflict. There are, indeed, theorists who hold that we might do without parties altogether, but no practical substitute has as yet been devised. To give up our traditional party government for a system of random faction under which no ministry could have a year's lease of life would not be a happy exchange. That, in the due course of that constitutional development which has already given us the boon of "responsible government," a time will come when, as the poet sings of the early Roman Republic, none will be for a party, but all will be for the State, it is, at least, permitted to hope. Meanwhile, if it can be shown that, even under our actual dispensation, it is possible to escape the bitterness of those old-world feuds, racial and religious, the revival of which during the past year is a deplorable anachronism, we ought to accept the lesson with gratitude and lose no time in turning it to good account.

The Hon. Mr. Joly has a peculiarly happy vantage-ground from which to address words of counsel and warning to the people of both races and communions in this Province. Representing one of the oldest families of the once dominant nationality, he is at the same time a member of a Protestant church. He is, moreover, qualified by training and experience to speak *ex cathedra* on the legal and political aspects of the question at issue. While the controversy was at its height, Mr. Joly abstained from meddling with it. Like many patriotic men, who saw that it had been given a direction which

could only lead to mischief, he felt that, till the excitement had somewhat quieted down, it would be vain to advise calm deliberation. In the heat of conflict the peacemaker is liable to be misunderstood by both sides. Now, however, that there is a pause—a permanent pause, we trust—in this long warfare of charge and recrimination. Mr. Joly seizes the opportunity of saying a few temperate words to those of his own creed. While he connects the latter agitation on the Jesuits' Estates Act with the earlier Riel movement, he acquits the *Parti National* of having foreseen the larger and deeper significance which the latter has assumed. But he adds: "If they will put themselves for one moment in the place of the English Protestants of Canada, they will easily understand why it was taken by them as a serious provocation." Nevertheless, neither in the execution of Riel nor in the Jesuits' Estates Bill does Mr. Joly find justification in the appeals made by both sides to religious and national feeling. As to the adverse sentiment that leading Protestants have aroused against the Act, Mr. Joly, though he shrinks from accusing them of wilful misinterpretation, or the desire to stir up religious antipathy, is forced to conclude that the result is as deplorable as if they had been blameworthy in both instances. As for the mass of the agitators, he doubts whether they have read the document. At any rate it is evident that it has not been carefully studied by those who use such terms as "endowment" and "confiscation" in dealing with the subject. The property of the Jesuits was not confiscated, he maintains, but escheated to the Crown through the failure of lawful heirs. The Order had committed no offence against the laws of England which would justify such a proceeding. As to the fear, to which some writers and speakers have given expression, lest the payment of the \$400,000 should be but the instalment of a larger sum, Mr. Joly points out that in the statute itself there is an explicit and absolute bar to any further claim. The introduction of the Pope's name in the preamble which gave so much offence to Protestants is by Mr. Joly deemed so essential for the final settlement of the question that, had he been a member of the Legislature at the time of its passage, he would have insisted on its insertion. If in any ordinary contract the sanction of the head of the firm or corporation that is a party to it is requisite to make it legally binding, surely it would have been strange to leave the Pope's name out of a settlement in which the Church was concerned. In fact, what to the lay mind might appear superfluous in the preamble, is, from a legal standpoint, "evidence of the minute precautions taken to secure a valid and final discharge and settlement for the Province of Quebec."

Such, in brief, is the view that Hon. Mr. Joly takes of this vexed question. We know that different judgments have been pronounced—even by Roman Catholics—of the wording of the Bill. His object is not to revive controversy, but to suggest methods of conciliation, and with the spirit of his letter and the desire which animates him we fully sympathize. "Every effort," as he says, "must be made to preserve the old feeling of mutual trust and forbearance, which has made us Canadians—English and French, Roman Catholics and Protestants live happily side by side in peace." He feels that the task is not easy; that whoever undertakes it runs the risk of giving offence. We are sure, nevertheless, that there are many who will applaud the mission of the peacemaker. Mr. Joly is not alone in wishing to see the end of the reign of rancorous controversy. Months ago, our correspondent, "W." in his pamphlet already noticed in our columns, preached that conciliation and good will of which his long life has set the example. While both sections of our people have such representatives, we need not despair of the restoration of harmony.—*Dominion Illustrated.*

The London *Echo* says:—"This story is from the Vale of Clwyd. Among the passengers in a train running between Rhyland and Denbigh were a very high dignitary of the Protestant Church, but who does not look his office, and an old Welsh farmer. The agriculturist, getting into conversation with the dignitary, remarked, looking at the clerical cut of his fellow-traveller's clothes. "I suppose you are a curate?" The dignitary, from very modesty, did not like to answer out that he was above a curate, so he simply replied, "I have been a curate once." "Dear me," exclaimed the old man, "'tis a great pity, young man; the drink again, no doubt."