

The CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS is published by THE BURLAND-DESBARATS LITHOGRAPHIC AND PUBLISHING COMPANY on the following conditions:—\$4.00 per annum in advance, \$4.50 if not paid strictly in advance, \$3.00 for clergymen, school-teachers and post-masters in advance.

All remittances and business communications to be addressed to G. B. BURLAND, General Manager.

All literary correspondence, contributions, &c., to be addressed to the Editor.

When an answer is required stamps for return postage must be enclosed.

City subscribers are requested to report at once to this office, either personally or by postal card, any irregularity in the delivery of their papers.

### NOTICE.

We are constantly receiving letters and messages for back numbers or extra numbers of the CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS. Our friends should remember that, in every case, a sufficient sum should be enclosed to pay for the price of the paper and the postage.

## CANADIAN ILLUSTRATED NEWS.

Montreal Saturday, 22nd July, 1876.

### FRENCH REPUBLICANISM.

At the banquet given at Versailles in commemoration of the birth of General HOUE, M. GAMBETTA delivered a long speech, in the course of which he gave his views and those of his party on the present aspect of Republicanism in France. He stated that what France wants is not merely the Republic, but Republican order: this has been insured, and ridiculous and factious pigmies can cause no uneasiness. They may, indeed, behind the scenes utter threats against the Republican institutions, and indulge in inflated language, but they will not be able to shake the confidence of the country, not only in its institutions, but in itself. If the Republican policy must be moderate, that does not prevent it from being firm. But in what must it be firm? In that which is the dominant sentiment of the French people. It must be firm in the points which have been desired and settled by the only authority to which the free-man should bow—the authority of the country asserting itself through the great voice of universal suffrage. But it is already engaged in this firm and prudent policy, the effects of which the country is experiencing at present: these obstacles will prove a gracious gift of fortune. What is most to be feared is majorities without equilibrium, without adversaries; majorities who, in the absence of opposition, might go astray. What Republicans wish for the country till democracy is thoroughly master of itself, enlightened and accustomed to carry out the wishes of the country, is that the Republican party shall have a hard life, because that will enable it to conquer; and when once its banner is hoisted, it will be too strong to dislodge. Frenchmen should not forget that they are in a country which has known fourteen centuries of monarchy, in which prejudices, superstitions, ignorance, abuse of protection in all its forms, local tyrannies, and oppression, have clogged, stopped, or interfered with everything, and they have to grapple with these difficulties. They have the right and the power. In their numbers they cannot doubt of victory. They need not fear; only remain calm, laborious, patient, and indefatigable. But, besides protecting Republican institutions, something else is necessary. By persuasion, by books and newspapers, by example, by political morality, the timid who are daily rising in numbers, the indifferent, and the rebellious, have to be gained over, for in a country like France the chief aim must be to unite all good citizens, independently of their past convictions. In following such a policy Republicans respond to that which is the most noble, the most elevated element in the French character, namely, generosity; and it must be asked not only of the Republican party; the other side must be generous too. This policy has two sides.—at home, Republican order; abroad, peace pursued with intelligence and persevering

discretion. If France had not been a Republic during recent events, would Europe have been free from fermentation? Thanks to the impersonality of her Government, there was no fear of her venturing into diplomatic complications which only end in bloodshed and warfare. The Republicans ensure peace not only for France, but perhaps for the world—but only if this Republic be really a French Republic, indifferent to all that is not for the national interest, and resolved to remain mistress of her own movements. Education, labour, and justice are the task before it, and they shall not fail, for in the ranks of the Republican party, whatever be its temperament and tendency, there is one dogma, one wish—that the free democracy may triumph.

### TWO PICTURES.

The terrible fate of CUSTER and his command on the banks of the Little Horn has drawn attention most forcibly to the American policy of dealing with the Indians. And very naturally so. The question cannot help arising on the difference between Americans and Canadians in their treatment of the Red Man. Better than any words of ours, that reason is depicted in the cartoon which we publish this week. Two things in this contrast are certainly remarkable. The first, that we have more Indians to deal with than the Americans, and the second, that we have fewer troops to bring against them. And yet, notwithstanding these facts, not only do our Indians give us no trouble, but they actually add to our total strength and rank as desirable citizens. The reasons of the difference are plain. When we make treaties with the Indians, they are made in good faith and we keep them. We sell no liquor to the Indians, and the law, making it a penal offence to give a Savage even one glass of spirit, is rigidly observed even in Ontario and Quebec. Next, we have no dishonest contractors and sutlers, acting as intermediaries between the Indians and the Government. The consequence is that all our Indians are peaceful and doing well in the career of civilization. These are facts that we state, and it is curious to note how prompt some of the American papers are to recognize them. The *New York Sun* says:

When Indians are robbed or murdered by whites in Canada, the transgressors are punished with as much severity as if it was the whites who had been wronged, while all the agreements made with the Indians by the Canadian authorities are fulfilled with scrupulous exactness. With us, however, the Indians are treated as if they had no right even to existence; friendly and peaceable bands have been wantonly slaughtered, not only by frontier ruffians, but by regular troops acting under the orders of officers so high in rank as Gen. SHERIDAN; and the agents of the Government who have been appointed to disburse the enormous appropriations made for the Indians have robbed them without mercy. Hundreds of innocent lives in unprotected settlements have been sacrificed to this ruinous and dishonest policy, and no one can foresee what the end will be, now that our people have undertaken to wrongfully wrest from the most warlike Indian nation on the continent the last remnant of their lands, after the Government had solemnly guaranteed to protect those Indians in the sole and exclusive possession thereof. It is no wonder that the Canadians, who have enjoyed the benefits of an entirely different policy, look with disfavor upon any proposal for an agreement which would expose them to the disastrous effects which have resulted from our faithless dealings with a weaker race.

### LACROSSE.

The visit of the combined White and Indians Teams to Great Britain is an event in the annals of Canadian athletics, and has given an impetus to the national game of Lacrosse. A few words on the sport may therefore be not out of place.

It was not till about the year 1856 that Lacrosse became popular as a field sport among white men: but for years its practice was limited to a very small number, and it was not till the arrival of the Prince of Wales in Canada, in 1861, that any very strong revival in the game took place. But even that revival did not last long; the game became unfashionable and remained so till early in 1867, when a party of Montreal men—not the Montreal Club—were defeated at Cornwall, Ont. That defeat awakened the spirit of young Montrealers, and the New Dominion being about to be proclaimed, it was proposed by Dr. G. W. Beers, in a letter published in the *Montreal Daily News*, in April of that year, and distributed throughout Canada, that the proclamation of the Dominion of Canada and the adoption of Lacrosse as Canada's national game should be simultaneous. This proposal was eagerly taken up throughout the country, and was duly accomplished. The first laws of Lacrosse were framed by the Montreal Club in June, 1867, and in September of the same year that Club called a Convention of Canadian Clubs, at which the National Lacrosse Association of Canada was formed; the laws were amended and a constitution framed and adopted. Since that date, Lacrosse steadily became more popular, and is now the means of affording a good healthy amusement to thousands of our Canadian youth. The present game of Lacrosse, as reduced to rule by the whites, employs the greatest combination of physical and mental activity white men can sustain in amusement, and is as much superior to the original as civilization to barbarism, or a pretty Canadian girl to an uncultivated squaw. One of the most popular features of Lacrosse is its extreme simplicity, thus making it so much more interesting to spectators than almost any other national pastime. Unlike Cricket, or Baseball, it requires no explanation. Lookers-on can see at a glance that the object of both sides is to put the ball through the goal of his opponent and prevent him getting it through; and all the running, throwing, and endless variety of play tends to that end. It has the merit, too, of being a cheap game, in which all can participate without much outlay. It is not exclusive; every player has his innings, so to speak, at the same time, and no one monopolizes the best part because he happens to be an extra good player. As a beneficial exercise it has no superior, combining as it does the benefit of several. It brings into operation at one time more muscle than any other game, requires a steady concentration of the mind while it is being played, sharpens the faculties of the dullest and equalizes its exercise over the entire system. The game deserves to be studied, and to that end there is no manual of instruction which can compare with that written by Dr. BEERS, the popular Captain of the late English Teams, and President of the Montreal Club. It is a handsome little volume published by DAWSON BROTHERS, and should be in every library, even of those who take no further interest than in the literature of the game.

### ENGLISH NEUTRALITY.

We have at length, from official sources, an outline of the policy which it is the purpose of Great Britain to follow in the present Turkish war. On last Friday, Lord Derby received a deputation on the Eastern question, consisting of 40 members of Parliament and 571 gentlemen from all parts of the Kingdom. Mr. BRIGHT presented a memorial in favor of strict neutrality, except when it may be possible to interpose and by friendly offices to mitigate the horrors, and to hasten the close of the war. Lord DERBY, in reply to Mr. BRIGHT, acknowledged the importance of the deputation, and spoke in sympathy with its objects. He said that although he might not endorse the exact expressions of the memorial, he agreed absolutely and entirely in its object. He had refused to adhere to the Berlin memorial because it was a compromise be-

tween powers who were desirous of acting together, yet not quite agreeing. He did not think, therefore, that a compromise would ultimately work. He felt sure the Porte would not accept it, nor even the insurgents. The rendezvous of the fleet in Besika Bay was not England's initiative, but of all the ambassadors at Constantinople, who wanted to be armed against eventualities, and against the massacre of British and other subjects so far as human foresight could discern. A general war was most unlikely to result from the present conflict. France and Italy, for financial and other reasons, did not desire war. Germany had no direct interest in the question. England will not make war, and Austria, though peculiarly placed, would not break the peace for reasons of self-interest. A powerful party in Russia sympathized with Slavonia, and desired the erection of a Slavonic empire under Russian guidance and influence. But that party was not in power. The Czar was a sincere lover of peace, and Russia had other reasons than her finances and the extent of her Asian conquests for not wishing war. The understanding reached at Reichstadt was on a basis of absolute non-intervention during the conflict, not excluding efforts in favor of peace, but if any steps should be taken, they would be in concert with all the powers. England's endeavors were to keep the conflict within its present limits, and to impress that view on others. Lord DERBY said he had no doubt of England's success, and continued, "All we desire is to see fair play. If Turkey is to decay we cannot help it. We have guaranteed Turkey against murder, but not against suicide or sudden death. If the opportunity of mediation offers, which opportunity may now be at hand, we shall avail of it."

### A WORKINGMEN'S DELEGATION.

One of the most interesting signs of the times is the deputation of French workmen from Lyons and other places to the United States for the purpose of practical study. The movement is worthy of all attention. The delegates are required to report upon the average wages of workmen in the United States; their hours of work; state of manufactures and health of workshops; whether industries are chiefly absorbed by large establishments; how much machinery has economized labor; whether workmen are often thrown out of work, and the causes and effects of such discharges; the condition of apprenticeship; laws and regulations between employers and employed; the condition of French workmen in the United States in comparison with that of those from other countries; the advantages or disadvantages of emigration; civil and political rights of emigrants; the injury to the workmen through competition; comparative value of French productions with those of other countries; whether French manufactures can compete in price with those of the United States and elsewhere; what manufactures exist in prisons, workhouses, and religious communities, and their effect upon outside industries; general information upon manufacturing establishments, their prosperity, their regulations by law, and their provision, if any, for the old and sick; information upon public assistance to the poor; imposts; public education, and whether compulsory; religious instruction in the free schools; whether free instruction in trades exists; whether the education of women is equal to that of men; whether the free union and association of workmen is untrammelled by the laws; whether universal suffrage exists in entirety, and how limited; whether public employments are open to all classes; the condition of women in manufactories, and whether they are recognized as the social equals of men; work of children, and at what ages; whether capital has a tendency to centralize or not, and view upon such centralization; the military organizations of the United States; information upon towns more especially given to manufacturing, and their regulations, and whether inventors are