

taught. They were admonished to maintain ever bright the fires of loyalty to France. He told them that in New England the good work of French colonization was spreading, and that in Louisiana the promise of future French domination was good. He advised his hearers not to permit their children to contract marriages with the English, but to keep themselves a separate people in every respect and to use the English language only when obliged to use it. These sentiments are only too common in Canada. At a recent meeting of the Royal Society of Canada at Montreal were several members of French extraction, but at the same time English subjects, as their ancestors for several generations had been. To the surprise of some of the American delegates, their papers were in the French language, although the audience was mostly English. The president, who was English, at the close of one of these papers, quietly but pleasantly remarked that the paper was interesting, but would have been more so if it had been in English. The rebuke was not sufficiently pointed, as many doubtless felt. Here were men who had been born and bred under the free and beneficent rule of England. To her broad and liberal institutions they owed a debt of gratitude which they could never repay, and yet they deliberately emphasized the fact that they were still French, and prided themselves in being so. We cannot understand this intense loyalty to a foreign power until we find its source in the religious teaching of these people. From the day of England's acquisition of the country they have been taught that her rule was to be temporary, and that Providence was at last to restore to France her ancient dominions. Rome, whom Cardinal Gibbons himself declares is ruled by "a bureau of administrators," and whom Victor Charbonel, in his late letter to the Pope relinquishing his clerical office, so fittingly denominates "an ecclesiastical organization, which uses religion for skillful administration, makes it a domineering power, a