

found to take their place. If they wish to retain it, and to be ultimately returned to power, they must make themselves worthy of doing so. There are signs of a re-awakening. The Conservative victory in Quebec is one of them. It was a victory of honest Liberals; nothing else will account for such a change. That a Province which in three preceding elections had been strongly Liberal should in a few months return such an overwhelming Conservative majority can be attributed to nothing but a huge Liberal secession. It was recognized as the only means of reconstruction, and it was unhesitatingly followed. Parasites are often killed only by violent measures, and it required something pretty strong to dispose of Mercier and Pacaud. In the same way the party throughout the Dominion may be restored to usefulness and power, after enjoying the pleasures of sin for a season. Two things are necessary; the restoration of honest methods, and a return to the policy which is right, not that which is expedient. These are occasions when the path of duty and the path of glory are the same. May not this be one of them?

F. W. F.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—It would not be proper for me again to intrude upon your columns any lengthened discussion. Permit me, however, to note, with pleasure, the very close approximation to which the discussion has brought us. We agree:—

1. That the State ought to protect itself from vice by education (or a modicum thereof).
2. Catholics may "unite and organize for the establishment and support of schools for the education of their children on any plan and according to any system which they deem best, so long as the intellectual education provided is sufficiently thorough to meet the reasonable requirements of the State in regard to citizenship."
3. "There could be no objection" "to confer corporate powers" upon them to enable them so "to unite and organize."
4. But these powers should not "enable compulsion to be used to make any one contribute to, and patronize, a denominational school against his will."
5. The State may properly raise money by taxation for the purposes of education.
6. There is nothing "more unjust than for it to use the taxes paid by the Catholic to aid the propagation of the doctrines which the good Catholic detests" (rightly or wrongly is immaterial).
7. Or, by parity of reasoning (let me add without agreement possibly), to use it in diffusing a purely secular education "which the good Catholic detests" (rightly or wrongly again immaterial); but that he is right, a large number of Protestant ministers would warmly testify. Possibly even you, sir, would balk at the French notion of a purely secular education).
8. And what more just (can we not agree?) that Catholics (united and organized by the State for the purposes of education) should be permitted to pay their own taxes, if they desire to do so, to their own schools, instead of having them applied to the erection of "rudderless warships" which they detest.

You have agreed to proposition three and four. If we add to these proposition eight (almost self-evident, I think) we have the Separate school system in Ontario, for there, as you are aware, it is purely optional with a Catholic whether he pay his taxes to the Catholic schools or to the Public schools. There is no "compulsion." If it be said that the Catholic schools receive a ratable share of other moneys, again I answer that that is not "a necessary part of the system. It might be an easily-answered argument for the stoppage of the supplement, but not for the abolition of the schools."

JOHN S. EWART.

A LOSS TO CANADIAN SCHOLARSHIP.

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—I sometimes see references concerning myself in the press which make me question whether I am myself or not. One of these is a statement in your issue of April 22nd, in the article "A Loss to Canadian Scholarship," which—contrary to my usual practice—I must notice, because it implies that I did some grievous injustice to my old and highly esteemed friend, the late Rev. Geo. Coull. Here is the statement: "In 1873, for the cause of health, he came to Nova Scotia. He was to have gone to Fredericton, N.B., but Dr. Grant sent him to New Glasgow, instead of into his true place, a college. He was buried there." The travesty of facts and the ludicrous conception of Dr. Grant's powers that these words convey is almost bewildering. It is enough to say that Mr. Coull came to Nova Scotia with a commission from the Col. Com. of the Church of Scotland to do ministerial work; that I had no more power than the writer of the article to send him to Fredericton, New Glasgow, or a College; that there was no College in Halifax needing Mr. Coull's services; that at the time I was neither Principal nor Dr.; and that New Glasgow is one of the intellectual centres of Nova Scotia.

It is unnecessary to dispute the accuracy of anything else in what I have quoted; though it seems almost neces-

sary to hint that to put any man, not to speak of an entire stranger and "a foreigner" into a College, is not so simple a matter as some writers imagine.

Kingston, April 23.

G. M. GRANT.

[The writer of the article referred to assures us that he had not the slightest desire to disparage Dr. Grant; he wrote solely from a wish to do justice to the memory of his distinguished and lamented friend, and from facts within his own knowledge and information afforded by others. Dr. Grant's word is of course unquestioned.—Ed.]

KINGSFORD'S HISTORY OF CANADA.*

WE welcome Dr. Kingsford's fifth volume which is, in all respects, quite up to the level of his previous contributions to the history of this country. In some ways the author has rather a difficult task in the first part of this volume, dealing, as he has to do, with the frequent risings of the Indians and the defence of the scattered forts, in the country west of the present Canada, from their assaults. It is not quite easy to gather these incidents together so as to produce anything like unity of effect; yet the story is an interesting, sometimes even an exciting, one, and it illustrates, like so many other stories, the strength and the weakness of British action and administration.

On the Indian side, the most remarkable figure is Pontiac, a man thoroughly ill-affected towards British rule, and only giving in where there was no chance of succeeding. As regards his character, Dr. Kingsford is undoubtedly right when he says, "he was in all respects a savage in his instincts, led by his passions, his jealousies, and his passing feeling; he can be looked upon in no higher light than the instrument of the French officials and traders." His cruelty was as aimless as it was barbarous, although he was not without ability; and he has some claim to ingenueness. "We love liquor," he says, speaking of his countrymen, "and did we live here as formerly our people would be always drunk, which might occasion quarrels between the soldiers and them." It is a relief to have done with Pontiac although "in reality nothing is known beyond the fact that he was killed by an Indian in 1767, and that his body was found, his skull cleft with a tomahawk."

The mention of French intrigue reminds us of the old relations between English and French—the English honesty and stupidity being generally remarked, over against French cleverness and unscrupulousness. Long ago the chronicler of the age of Charles XI. of France told us that the English are very good sort of people, but very stupid. "Never was there a treaty," he says, "between the English and French in which the sense and cleverness of the French did not show themselves superior to those of the English. It is indeed a common saying with the English, which I have heard in treating with them, that they always or generally have got the best of their battles with the French, but loss and damage in the treaties they have with them." Some such reflections would have been quite in place in Dr. Kingsford's history; but, after all, there is this comfort remaining, that these clever fellows generally outwit themselves in the long run, and the stupid ones remain in possession.

Certainly there was a good deal of stupidity shown on the English side in dealing with the Indians. On the one side, nothing could be much better than Bouquet's management of the business entrusted to him; but nothing could be much worse than that of Bradstreet. It makes an Englishman almost "mad" to read the record of his unvarying want of knowledge, observation, ability, although Mr. Kingsford's narrative is as calm and dispassionate as that of an historian ought to be. If it is a comfort to hear the decisive tones of Bouquet in dealing with those savages, "I am now to tell you, we will no longer be imposed upon by your promises. The army shall not leave your country, till you have fully complied with every condition that is to precede my treaty with you"—if words like these give unmingled satisfaction, there is a great deal of a very different character to get angry over. That eternal English disposition to despise an enemy, which has wrought them evil in every country and every age, comes out conspicuously in this history (see p. 41). It was not Bradstreet this time, his friends might be glad to hear, but Dalyell, who was responsible for the "bloody run."

We pass away from this portion of the history with two matters of congratulation. In the first place, the dispossession of the French from the country west of the Mississippi was a gain. But for this, "we should have had a western Acadia, with its disaffection, disloyalty, and machinations." On the other hand, we have a just and equitable settlement of the claims of the Indians—one which was, naturally, far from satisfactory to many of the selfish and covetous settlers of the period. It was indeed, as Dr. Kingsford remarks, "extremely unpopular in the British provinces"; but "it is a proof of the wisdom and justice of these provisions that the principle then laid down has always been acted on in the Queen's dominions."

Leaving the Indian troubles in the west, we turn to Quebec and its affairs. The first newspaper, the *Quebec Gazette*, printed in Philadelphia, came out in 1764. Soon after came the first quarter sessions grand jury, an insti-

*The History of Canada. By William Kingsford, LL.D., F.R.S.C. Vol. V. 1763-1775. With Maps. Price \$3.00. Toronto: Rowse and Hutchison; London: Kegan Paul and Company. 1892.

tution at first very little understood, even as the presiding judge seemed to have little understanding of the people over whom he was appointed. We wish we had space to give some estimate of Murray's Government; but we must refer the reader to Dr. Kingsford's careful and impartial account. To us it seems that Murray was not merely before his time, but he was trying to do what very few people want to be done, equal justice to all. The man who attempts this in advance of public opinion always has to suffer for it. We quite agree with the author that Murray's administration was "honest and enlightened." The closing scene of his life, in another place, shows what the man was made of.

From Murray we pass to Carleton, afterwards Lord Dorchester, "one of those rare men who, during a long and varied public life, lived so utterly irreproachably, that his memory remains untainted by the charge of a semblance of a vice." These are strong words, yet not unjustified by the history of the man who had laid upon him the arduous task of adjusting the law of Quebec, so as to meet the demands of the French clergy and laity, and yet work in some of the advantages of the Common Law. Dr. Kingsford gives a full account of the difficulties by which he was met and the manner in which he surmounted them.

And this brings us to the beginning of the uprising in the New England States, a subject which could not be avoided in a history of Canada, not merely because at that time all these provinces were equally dependencies of the British Crown, but also on account of the hostilities between the rebels and the Canadians, as, for example, in the attempt of Arnold upon Quebec. In some respects Dr. Kingsford seems here to move with an easier and more assured step. It is not that he does not think for himself or that he adopts the conclusions now generally accepted. There is not, we suppose, any great difficulty of opinion on any of the principal points connected with the rise and progress of the American Revolution. But the author sets forth in a plain and sensible manner the different causes which were at work to produce misunderstanding and bad feeling between the Mother Country and the colony.

It comes natural to a young country—especially a colony composed of people of our blood—to wish to manage its own affairs; and it is equally natural for people at home to imagine that this is their business. People are sent out from England to fill posts which those who are on the spot think belonged properly to themselves. Differences of opinion arise on many subjects until a degree of sensitiveness is produced on both sides, so that the colonists are almost on the watch to take offence, and the Home Government is obstinately resolved to make no concessions.

Everyone can see now—what Dr. Kingsford so well remarks—that the British Government ought either to have given way or else made vigorous preparations to insist upon their prerogative. In the first instance there was no thought whatever, on the part of the colonists, of breaking away from the Mother Country, and it was a long time before they could have entertained the hope of being able to do so. Dr. Kingsford has some excellent remarks (p. 368) on the subject of attachment to the Mother Country in reference to present circumstances and to those of the period of the revolution; and he shows how little trouble the people at home gave themselves to understand the feelings and wishes of the colonists. The character of George III.—no inconsiderable factor in the business—is well sketched in its weakness and in its strength. The importance of Bunker Hill (is Dr. Kingsford right in calling it Bunker's Hill?) is properly estimated.

But it is unnecessary to dwell longer upon a period so familiar. We must congratulate the author on being able to bring out these important volumes with so much regularity. There is no diminution in the high qualities by which the earlier volumes were distinguished, whilst there are, in other ways, marks of improvement. We have the same exhaustive use of original materials, the same fairness and freedom from bias, the same fulness of detail, whilst we think there is a freer hand and an easier movement than we remarked at the beginning of the work. We sincerely hope that it may be brought to a successful termination.

ART NOTES.

MR. WALTER ARMSTRONG has been elected to fill the office of Director of the Irish National Gallery at Dublin, in the place of the late Mr. Doyle. Unlike the latter, Mr. Armstrong is not an Irishman. He gets \$3,000 per annum, a residence in the best part of Dublin and his travelling expenses.

La Maison de Molière is the proud and affectionate title which the comedians give to the Comédie Française, that noble monument where the glory of Molière is enshrined. The House of Molière is indeed the house of a grand seigneur, with its staircases adorned with statues, its sumptuous saloons, its gallery of statuary and paintings, its thousand souvenirs and relics of the past that bear witness to a long and illustrious lineage. It is unlike any other theatre. In the vestibule the exhibition of the art treasures of the house begins. It is a rotunda with vaulted roof, walls covered with mirror glass, and staircases radiating on either hand. In the centre is a marble statue by David d'Angers, representing Talma in the costume and attitude of a Cæsar, studying a rôle. On each side of Talma is an allegorical statue, "Tragedy," by Thomas, and "Comedy,"