

The Kingston
Monument.

Five monuments have been raised to the memory of the Right Honourable Sir John A. Macdonald in as many centres of Canadian life, since his death in 1891; and of all these, none is in a more fitting place or combines as well national and local associations as the one which was unveiled last week in Kingston. The monuments in Hamilton, Toronto, and Montreal are local, and the subscriptions for each of them were confined to the locality; only that in Ottawa is national, being entirely at the public expense; but hundreds of people, in places that could not afford separate tributes, felt that they might well help to raise one in the Limestone City where he had spent the greater part of his life, which he had represented so long in Parliament, and in whose churchyard he sleeps his long sleep, beside those whom he loved with all the affection of a warm Highland nature. Hence, contributions were freely given to it through local committees, all the way from Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island to British Columbia, and His Excellency the late Governor-General also sent a handsome contribution. Appropriately, therefore, the representatives of the Federal and Provincial Governments joined with the citizens in making the dedication or unveiling a brilliant success; and the vast crowd from the city and the neighbouring counties showed how truly Sir John still lives in the "unforgetting hearts" of his countrymen. The speeches were worthy of the occasion. Almost everyone struck the same notes, but the independence of thought was so decided that they can be read without weariness, while they were listened to with the most profound attention throughout a long October afternoon. Every reference to his intense Canadianism, and to his deep conviction that only through abiding union with the Empire could Canada's welfare be preserved, elicited the loudest and most general applause. The "oration" of the Honourable Mr. Montague was up to his level, though somewhat wordy; the Premier's speech had a warmth and directness which convinced everyone that it came from the heart; while that of the Hon. G. W. Ross was in his very best form, and coming from a political opponent was especially grateful to the audience. The speeches of course will be forgotten in a few days or weeks; but for long years, the phalanxes of children, who sang patriotic songs and saw the Union Jack drawn aside from the noble form, and at the same moment another run up to the summit of the flag-pole, will remember the part they played, and they and their children will often gather at the entrance of the park, to gaze on the features of the Chief and to read the inscription, "A British subject I was born, and a British subject I will die."

Concerning
Luck.

The Premier, in a happy definition which he gave as a quotation, showed how little Sir John was indebted to that god of the idle and shiftless, known as Luck. The world is not ruled by throws of the dice but by a wise and purposive Providence, and when men who thought themselves Sir John's equals or superiors cursed their ill luck and attributed his success to the good "luck of the Wizard," they were forgetting this cardinal truth. Luck, said Sir Mackenzie Bowell, is "direction which we cannot see." The subtle qualities which go to make up the statesman are not visible. Only men who have them in some measure themselves can discern their signs; and the best sign of Sir John's greatness was that they who knew him longest and most intimately loved him best, and trusted him most implicitly. It was touching to hear his old follower, who now occupies his high place, speak with a tremor in the voice of "his tact, judg-

ment, fineness of touch, and delicacy of perception." "In him," he added, with true eloquence, "nothing was wasted. He knew intuitively when to be silent and when to speak; when to be inert and when to act; what to say and what to do." It was well to impress upon the young men before him that Sir John owed little to fortune, that "he was no ready-made statesman," that "nothing came to him fortuitously," and "that he began the world without money, without influence, with nothing more than a grammar school education." We trust that many will take the lesson to heart.

Mr. Laurier and
La Patrie.

A notable incident of the week in political matters has been the formal repudiation by Mr. Laurier, and by Mr. Marchand, of *La Patrie*, as a Liberal newspaper. It would have been well had this taken place long ago, for this journal, which has always been radical has been, of late years, very erratic. It has had among its recent editors, an American of French descent, and an Old Country Frenchman of extreme views; and the editorial policy of the paper as formulated by them and continued by their successors has been in favour of annexation and hostile to all things British. It is openly antagonistic to the Roman Catholic Church; and has very frequently embarrassed Liberals by the vigour of its denunciations of the bishops at a moment when the party was seeking to secure their neutrality in election contests. The repudiation by Mr. Laurier and Mr. Marchand followed an announcement that it would be hereafter edited by G. E. Langeois, the proprietor of *La Liberté*, of St. Scholastique which under the name of *L'Eche des Deux Montagnes* was placed under the ban of the Roman Catholic Church a couple of years ago. The article went on to say that "*La Liberté* is not afraid to march in the steps of *L'Avenir* and of *Le Pays*, and to sound the note, the only good and true one, of the Liberal party of the old days." "Have we need," it added, "of affirming again that this has always been and always will be the note of *La Patrie*?" Mr. Laurier, in a personal letter to Mr. Beaugrand, the proprietor of *La Patrie*, disowned these sentiments, and said they were not those of the Liberal party. "Since I have taken the direction of the Liberal party," wrote Mr. Laurier, "I have constantly endeavoured to keep it in the great lines of the Liberal school of England, and it will not leave this path as long as I shall continue to occupy the post at which I am." Mr. Beaugrand replied in a signed article in *La Patrie* in which he made it clear that he did not desire nor intend that the Liberal party should be held responsible for the expressions of his paper. In his letter Mr. Beaugrand said:

"No, my dear Mr. Laurier, the programme of olden times was worth much—and for my part I think it was worth more—than to-day's programme. Now, two words about the great English Liberal school which you sometimes invoke, even as in Toronto, at the expense of a great French Liberal school. It is a notorious fact that your tastes, your political education, your so correct and so precise English language differ entirely from my humble way of seeing and of proceeding. You repudiate the French Revolution and I admire it; not in its excesses nor its exaggerations, but in its effects; in its legislation and in its tradition. I prefer Thiers, Henri Martin, and Michelet to Macaulay or to Hume. I prefer the French Republic of this day to the aristocratic and notoriously anti-democratic English form of government, and, like Lord Rosebery, I would like to see the abolition of the privileges of birth, of birthright, and of stupid precedences of the House of Lords."

Mr. Beaugrand proclaims, that while he is loyal to Canada, as the land of his birth, he regards France as his mother land, and concludes his letter by reiterating his faith in Mr. Laurier's general policy, and states that he will continue to urge his readers to support him.