

ences that seem to assist them so materially in coming to their decisions. There can be no doubt in any one's mind that the blending of two such important positions as the superintendency of the city schools and the principalship of the Grammar School is an unwise step to take, and if it be proved to have been only a means to an end, the end being the resignation of Mr. Hay, the matter will not in all probability die for lack of discussion. In this connection, we have to say that there is far too much of the indirect method of "squeezing out" practised by some of our school boards, and Mr. Hay's complaint of having been ignored in order that his enemies might say that he kept himself too much aloof from his employers, gives the clue to the method adopted to discredit him as a public servant, which are by no means new in the experience of other public officers.

While the attempt is being made to foster a national spirit with "Canada First" for its watchword, through the efforts of the Committee on a new School History for Canada, the rulers of the city of Quebec are running away from the historic notion, and have been seized with something like a passion against the antique on and around Cape Diamond. Of course it is said that if the modern improvements of city life necessitate the removal of walls and fortifications and other relics of the past, so much the worse for the relics of the past, and so much the better for the policy of the city corporation of the ancient capital in their attempts to improve and beautify off the face of the earth what they have never for a moment thought to contemplate as belonging to any one but themselves. Not long ago, the writer stood watching the last of St. John's Gate as it was being removed to make way for the Quebec District Railway, and when the main

strength of the structure came to be laid bare, and the bystanders were overheard discussing its original cost and the ceremonial of its opening as late as 1867, it was difficult to refrain from drawing the conclusion that somebody past or present had either been foolish or extravagant. But when Sir James LeMoine comes out over his own signature, and, while entering his protest, announces to us Canadians that the city walls are likely to go next, it is even easier to suppose a projected indiscretion on the part of somebody or other. Perhaps Sir James, backed up by his friend Mr. Kirby, has only been trying to frighten us. There may be nothing in the thing but a mere surmise. But if there be, the city council may find that the discussion over the project is not likely to find its limits on the streets or in the newspapers of Quebec. The walls of Quebec do not belong to the city of Quebec, but to the country at large, perhaps to Great Britain if the disburers of the original cost have any claims, though it is to be hoped that the question of ownership will never be raised in any antagonist spirit. We Canadians want Quebec as an object lesson to the rising generation, an object lesson on the origin and growth of the country, and we want it as a commercial outlook also. But there must be no huckstering spirit in the advocacy either for or against the removal of the antiquities of the place. We want these antiquities preserved, not because we would hinder Quebec from taking advantage of all the modern improvements of city life, but because we take a national pride in them; and the citizens of Quebec should not want to keep them, either because the city may gain in revenue from increasing sightseers, or because there would be more money gained to the city to get rid of them. There are surely some higher motives than