

WHAT OUR CURBSTONE OBSERVER HAS TO SAY ABOUT "CANADIANISM."

On the occasion of the 32nd anniversary of Confederation the "True Witness" published an editorial in which a broad and patriotic Canadian national spirit was advocated...

In this connection a letter appeared in the "Daily Telegraph," Quebec, on the 4th July, signed by "A French Canadian School Teacher," which is well deserving of notice...

The Committee are of opinion that, in all the schools, an effort should be made to put an end to the prejudices of antagonism which are unhappily being perpetuated in Canada...

The writer thus comments on the above: "There can be no question that this sentiment does honor to those who thus gave it expression."

precious truth is overlooked and the rising generation are not instructed in it? If so, let us not hesitate to confess that such institutions are guilty of a most deplorable oversight...

"In fine, short of proclaiming himself an enemy of his country and of openly professing hatred for his fellow citizens, no sensible man—I do not speak of hotheads or cranks—can object to seeing young Canadians taught to know and understand that a common country makes them compatriots."

This letter gave rise to an editorial in the "Daily Telegraph," from which for reasons that will later on become obvious, I intend to quote. That organ, amongst other things, said: "It is certainly of happy augury for the future that, among our French Canadian fellow-citizens and particularly among the class to whom the training of the young is committed, men are to be found who can rise superior to the narrow sectionalism which cripples so much of our energies and tends to perpetuate in this New World the unhappy divisions, prejudices and antagonisms of the Old."

"Every effort should be made to render the education of our youth more practical. All the great progressive countries of the world are just now straining every nerve to equip their youth more fully for the great battle of life, stress being laid chiefly on technical and commercial education. We are reminded that the commercial education which is now the great aim of the most enterprising and enlightened nations is not the mere training in book-keeping, figures, the drawing up of accounts current,

promissory notes, bills of exchange, etc., which have been so long considered in the staples of commercial education in this country. These are good enough in their way to make book-keepers, clerks and accountants, but the great merchant and the successful business man require a good deal more to equip them properly for the fight against modern competition...

Here are two distinct questions raised, that of a Canadian national spirit, and that of adequate commercial training. I have deemed it necessary to fill up a considerable amount of my allotted space with the foregoing quotations, because they will serve as texts whereon to build the framework of future contributions. I will not attempt to deal with the education question in this issue, for I have too much to say about it, and I do not wish that those who honor me by reading this column should lose any of the criticisms I feel obliged to make. I will merely treat of the Canadian patriotic spirit, side of the subject, this week, and reserve for next week a great deal of matter that may prove more interesting than palatable to some people.

While I know that the vast majority of Canadians, of all races and creeds, will applaud with both hands the sentiments conveyed in the above cited letter from a French Canadian School Teacher, still I am perfectly aware that the day is yet distant when a general Canadian spirit will become universal in this Dominion. So long as there are men—especially writers—who are so blinded by prejudice that they can see only an enemy in every being not of their own race, or creed, so long will Canada have to submit to the postponement of the great era of her material as well as political, national, and even social success. Were there only men of one political party, or of one race, or of one creed, to be blamed for the per-

petuation of useless illfeeling, and suicidal prejudices, we might expect to be ultimately able to open the eyes of those people to the excess of their folly, but when we find, here and there, isolated examples of this unhappy class, cropping up in both political camps, and in different sections of the community, we must admit the difficulty of coping with the hydra of disunion.

Let me take one example—I could cite others, but this one must suffice for the present. In "La Verite" of July 8, Mr. J. P. Tardivel treats his readers to an article on Dominion Day. As usual it is written in that able and attractive style which characterizes Mr. Tardivel's every work. There is a something peculiar about Mr. Tardivel's compositions that always makes them impressive, a something that always comes to me like a memory, or an echo, or a once familiar voice, yet I am ever unable to define exactly what that something is. Does it remind me of Venutell, or of Thorne? I know not; possibly a mixture of both—the Ultramontanist of the former, without the genius that created its own obstacles in order to overthrow them, or the slashing, reckless, dogmatic, autocratic, furious, unbending, and often uncharitable pugnaciousness of the latter, without the excuse of an enthusiastic convert to palliate it. Sincere even to the verge of fanaticism, Mr. Tardivel spares no one, when his pen is transformed into a sword of controversy; honest to a degree of remarkable scrupulousness, he must write from conviction—otherwise his tirades would give excuse for very harsh terms on the part of his opponents. I, for one, would not care to measure swords with him, no matter how convinced I was of the justice of my cause; the oftener he would be foiled, the oftener and the more furiously would he return to the attack. There are persons with whom you must either absolutely agree upon every point, and on every question or else make sure that you do not commit the folly of

casting a doubt upon their infallibility—in journalism "La Verite" represents this category of individuals.

For the reasons above given I would not care to undertake a "set-to" with such a writer as Mr. Tardivel, and yet I feel obliged to quote from his article on "Dominion Day." I never wrestled with a giant, or an angel, nor have I any ambition to undertake such a pastime; I have never attempted to agree with a blind man on the subject of color, or light, life is too short to be thus wasted away; no more will I criticise Mr. Tardivel's "Dominion Day" editorial. I will merely quote from it, and leave to my readers the easy task of contrasting it with the extracts taken from the School Teacher's letter, and from the "Daily Telegraph's" editorial. Decidedly Mr. Tardivel cannot find fault with me if I translate some of his remarks: to characterize them I will not—because, as I before intimated I am somewhat of a coward, especially where there is nothing to be gained by receiving blows, and the opponent is beyond redemption as far as convincing him goes.

Here is Mr. Tardivel's idea of a Canadian national spirit. He writes thus:—

"The Canadian Confederation has just celebrated without the least display, its 32nd anniversary. The 1st July, is purely 'statutory' holiday. It is not a 'national feast.' Banks and offices are closed on that day; there are cheap excursions of which a good many people take advantage; business is more or less stopped. But no patriotic fibre is stirred on the occasion of Dominion Day. It is the anniversary of a national marriage; or rather of one that was believed to be national and necessary. Love played no part in the union contracted in 1867."

It would be too long for my space to translate the whole article, but the writer conveys the idea that many French Canadians mistrusted the fusion of races in a Canadian nationality, and feared that the French-Canadian nationality would disappear. He declares—and properly so—

that the St. Jean Baptiste and not the 1st July, is the national feast of the French Canadians, (so is the 17th March, that of the Irish-Canadians, I might add).

I must, however, give the following paragraph in the words of the writer: "For the French-Canadians, their true country is always the Province of Quebec. If we are attached to the French groups in other Provinces, it is by the olden ties of blood, of language and traditions, not by the political bond created in 1867. We interest ourselves in our brethren of the East, and the West, because they are our 'brothers,' but not because they are our 'fellow-citizens.' We have certain business relations with the English-speaking populations of the other Provinces; but we do not feel the slightest 'fraternal' sentiment towards them."

They are for us, and we are for them, merely 'associates,' agreeing more or less. But particularly speaking, we are no more bound to the English of Ontario and New Brunswick, than to the people of New York and Vermont."

I will not comment upon these sentiments. They appeared in "La Verite," and were conceived and written by Mr. Tardivel—at least I expect he is the author, both on account of his being editor and proprietor, and on account of the style. As "La Verite," (Truth) cannot err, and as the one who publishes Truth must be infallible, I will not dare to dispute the existence of sentiments such as these paragraphs contain. The second part of the article on "Dominion Day," is decidedly illogical, and unfounded in fact—as far as the responsibility of Confederation for French Canadian emigration goes—but it is present foreign to my subject. I have much pleasure in leaving to the readers of the "True Witness" the delicate and interesting task of passing judgment (in their own minds) upon the Canadian patriotism displayed by "La Verite."

A Peculiar Law in France.

France has some very curious laws, and none more than one which went into force on the first of last month. It is in connections with pensions to be paid by employers to employees, under given circumstances and conditions. The following text of the law will prove interesting reading for all connected with labor movements, or devoted to the labor cause:—

"Accidents occurring in the course of work to workmen and employees in the following occupations: Building, workshops, yard work, manufactories, transportation by land and water, loading and unloading ships, mines, quarries, and every operation, in whole or in part, in which are manufactured or handled explosive materials or in which use is made of motive power other than that of man or animals—give the victim, or those depending directly upon him, a right to indemnity at the expense of the head of the enterprise, on condition that the interruption of work exceeds four days.

"For actual and permanent incapacity a pension equal to two-thirds of the annual wages of the incapacitated; for partial but permanent incapacity, to one-half the difference between his annual salary and his reduced salary occasioned by the accident; for temporary incapacity, a daily indemnity of one-half the wages of the incapacitated at the time of the accident, the indemnity beginning on the fifth day after the accident.

"When the accident proves fatal a pension is allotted on the following conditions to the persons stated:— (a) A life pension, equal to 20 per cent. of the annual wages of the victim, to the surviving widow or widower who is neither divorced nor separated, the marriage to have been consummated prior to the accident. Should the widow marry she forfeits her right to this pension, but will be allotted three times the amount of her annual pension in one sum as a final adjustment. (b) For the children, legitimate or natural, recognized before the accident, orphans of father or mother, un-

der sixteen years of age, pensions, calculated on the annual wages of the victim, of 15 per cent. of those wages in the case of only one child, 25 per cent., if there are two children, 35 per cent., if there are three children, and 40 per cent., for four or more children. For children deprived of both parents the pension is 20 per cent. for each child, but cannot exceed in the aggregate 60 per cent.

"(c) If the victim leaves neither widow nor children, as per (a) and (b), each of the ascendants who depended on him will receive a pension up to sixteen years. This pension will be equal to 10 per cent. of the annual wages of the victim, but in no case can it exceed 30 per cent.

"The pensions allowed in virtue of the present law are payable quarterly, and cannot be transferred, nor are they subject to seizure.

"Foreign workmen victims of accidents in France, who cease to reside in French territory will receive as total indemnity an amount equal to three years' pension; members of their families not resident in French territory at the time of the accident will receive no indemnity.

"Employers are also held responsible for medical, pharmaceutical and funeral expenses. The maximum funeral expenses cannot exceed 100 francs (\$10.50).

"Employers can relieve themselves, during the thirty, sixty or ninety days following accidents, of the obligations of paying to the victims the expenses of the accidents and the temporary indemnities or parts only of these indemnities, as specified here-with following, if they can show:— (a) That their workmen have joined a mutual-aid society and they (the employers) have paid their share of the subscriptions to such society by mutual agreement; but such share shall never be less than one-third the total subscriptions.

"(b) That such society assure its members, in case of accidents, during thirty, sixty or ninety days, medical care and daily indemnity. If such indemnity is less than one-half the daily

wages of the injured the employer must make good the difference.

"Full pensions and indemnities are allowed on wages amounting to 2,400 francs (\$163.20) per annum. On all wages above that sum pensions and indemnities are calculated at the rate of one-fourth the regular allowances."

While this elaborate scheme may be considered as a boon to the workmen in general, still it is liable, in its application to result in greater injury than good. In order to minimize the risks, employers will certainly refuse, as much as possible, to employ married men, and especially men with families. Likewise, in border districts and even in central sections, will naturally give the preference to foreign workmen, to the injury and may be permanent loss of native laborers. However the law is now in existence, and time only can tell what its effects will be on France.

TOUCHING AND BEAUTIFUL.

After describing the grief-stricken condition of the household of the late Judge Semmes, of New Orleans, the "Daily Picayune," says:—

There is another in that sad home to whom sympathy goes out in this hour of sorrow, and that is "Mammy," faithful old Mammy, who was Mrs. Semmes' nurse and maid in girlhood years—Mammy, who nursed all the children of her young mistress, and who was looked upon in that household with reverence befitting her many and valued services and rare fidelity. It is pathetic to hear Mammy tell in her own simple, old-fashioned way the story of the death of her dear old "master"; for Mammy never accepted freedom and Mr. Semmes was always the "boss," and Mrs. Semmes her young "miss." Mammy stood by the bier yesterday telling "Miss Cora" the story of the "master's" death, and no one could refrain from tears. The voice of the old woman trembled, and the tears ran down her cheeks as she went over all the sad details of that fateful night. Mrs. Semmes was absent from the city, and the servants were in charge of the mansion. About 11.30 o'clock,

Mammy, says, Mr. Semmes came home and went to his room. He had been in the house scarcely ten minutes when he went out on the back gallery and called: "Mammy, Mammy. Come to me; I am feeling ill." Mammy rose hastily and went to her old master. She says he had been disrobing for the night when he called her. He was gasping for breath and said: "Mammy, I feel so strange, so strange, I am suffocating." Mammy had been fanning him and bathing his face. She looked at him and saw a strange pallor on his face—a pallor which her experienced eye knew too well. She cried: "Oh, master, I am going for the doctor; you need a doctor." And she called "Betsy, Betsy," to the maid servant. "Come and stay with Mr. Semmes; he is sick and I am going for the doctor."

And the faithful old soul in her bare feet and night gown, rushed into the street wildly, and knocked at Dr. Chaille's door. It was just a few steps from the house, but the doctor was not in. She saw a man passing and she cried: "Oh, sir, tell me, please, where I can find a doctor." He told her to go over to Dr. Lyons. "How did I know where Dr. Lyons' was?" said Mammy. "I said to myself, 'Oh, may God help me,' and seeing two gentlemen standing over at the corner of Canal and South Rampart street, near Mr. Fourcade's drug store, I went to them and said: 'Oh, gentlemen, tell me where I can find a doctor.' I am a doctor said one of the gentlemen. Then, sir, for the love of God, please come to Mr. Semmes; he is dying." Judge Semmes? inquired the doctor. "Yes, come quick, come quick!" And the gentleman who was none other than Dr. Mioton, rushed with the half-crazed old woman to the Semmes residence. Entering the room, Mammy says that she heard Mr. Semmes saying: "Oh, Lord have mercy upon me; Christ have mercy upon me." The doctor felt his pulse and shook his head. "He is dying," he said. "There is nothing to be done." Mammy says that she fell on her knees at his side and began to pray. "Pray," said Mr. Semmes, "pray with me," and still he kept repeating, "Lord have mercy upon me. Sweet Jesus, take pity and save my soul." "Kiss the cross," said Mammy and she held the blessed symbol of salvation to his lips. He kissed the cross, and with the words, "Oh, Lord, have mercy upon my soul!" he gasped once, twice and all was over. Mammy closed his eyes and sadly turned to do what must be done—informed the family of the dreadful event of that night.

JUSTICE IN IRELAND.

Justice has always been represented as being blindfolded; never was the symbolical bandage over the eyes of that goddess more suitable and appropriate than in Ireland. We do not refer to the days of the Penal Laws, nor to the evil times that preceded Emancipation, but to the present day. Despite all the enlightenment of this country, and all the changes favorable to Ireland, that it has witnessed, still the Irish Catholic has but a slim opportunity of securing justice—even in the lower courts, and in matters of no public concern.

The other day, in the House of Commons, on the vote of £30,895 to complete the sum needed for criminal prosecutions and other laws in Ireland, Mr. T. M. Healy made a remarkable speech in which he called attention to the shocking murder in Cork of a debt collector by a constable. The man was convicted and sentenced and reprobated by the Government. He did not like to condemn a

man who was not there to defend himself, but he wanted to know whether because this man was a policeman, he was not to be punished as an ordinary citizen. He considered it a graceful and merciful act to reprieve any prisoner, but it was a gross scandal that a man should be reprieved simply because he was a policeman. The hon. member went on to complain that as between Catholic and Protestant there was no question of the Catholic. It was easy to get an array of Protestants in the jury box. They had only to ask for a special jury. What was wanted was the repeal of the Act of '76, and the going back to O'Hagan's Act of '71. In any case between Crown and subject, or an acute question between Catholic and Protestant, there was absolutely no chance for the common Catholic. Only recently the Court of Appeal, consisting of two or three Protestant judges, changed the venue from the City of Dublin and sent the defendant to take his trial at Downpatrick before a jury of Orangemen.

This question went to the root of the administration of justice. The

system was diseased. Let any Catholic bring his action he would be met with a demand for a special jury, and would find arrayed against him twelve of his political enemies. Justice, so far as the general body of the people was concerned was dead, or rather, he should say, was not dead, because it had never existed. Now, on this vote they had got down for payments to sheriffs £8,820. He did not quarrel with the item, because they must have a sheriff in every county, but was it true that this vote was confined to county sheriffs? How was it that the city sheriffs did not get a single shilling of this money, whereas the county gentleman, who had broad acres and what was called a stake in the country were re-couped and compensated. Who invented this system of making a difference between county and city sheriffs? What was the difference between a sheriff and a sheriff's?

There is a refined sense of injustice in this system of calling special juries. As Mr. Healy explains, whenever it was deemed advisable to administer law—but not justice,—to an Irish Catholic, a mere motion for a special jury suffices to array twelve of his bitter enemies against him. In this Province of Quebec we have a law that permits, in criminal matters, the summoning of a special jury, and in virtue of that law the accused may always demand and is certain to obtain a mixed jury—the one-half speaking his language. This is in almost every case a safeguard of justice; in fact it is open to no criticism. But it is otherwise in Ireland. There the special jury means in a sense, a "packed jury," one composed entirely of men of a certain religious belief. No matter how honest the intentions of these men might be, they are all human nature, like ourselves, and just as liable to be swayed by their prejudices. The letter of the law, when put into practice, destroys the spirit of the law, when admitted only in theory.

But it has ever been so in Ireland, and will ever so continue until such time as Irishmen make their own laws in a native or Home Rule Legislature.