

That may be the law of Ontario, but it decidedly is not the "law of Canada" in the Province of Quebec. Here a young girl, in the circumstances set forth in your article, would have an action technically styled an *declaration de paternite* against her betrayer for the support of her child and for damages, and that quite irrespective of whether or not she had a single relation in the world. Seduction is not a "permitted crime" in the Province of Quebec, whatever it may be in other parts of Canada.

MONTREAL, 17th Oct. 1881. LEX.

Collector, was justifiable," and that the participants in the discussion were to be the editor of the *Globe* and his confere of the *Mail*, who had kindly consented to argue this question, chiefly to afford the younger members of the society an opportunity of hearing the principles of pure logic practically applied.

The chairman having announced that the editor of the *Mail* would support the affirmative, that distinguished scholar and gentleman came forward and said:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen—For good and sufficient reasons the speeches on this occasion are limited to one minute each, so I will at once tackle my subject. I hold that the seizure was justified, because the law provides for the exclusion of indecent books, and these books are indecent. As I have the privilege of replying I will say no more just now excepting this, that of course the law does not contemplate the exclusion of Beaumont and Fletcher's works, Rabelais, Shakespeare, and others, and therefore these ought not to be excluded.

The *Editor of the Globe*.—Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen—My opponent says the law is intended to exclude indecent books, and for this reason Paine and Voltaire should be shut out. But the other authors he has named are decidedly more indecent, why then should they not be excluded? To be sure, Paine and Voltaire are blasphemous, but the law confines itself to indecency. Let my opponent state plainly why the other indecent books should not be shut out as well as Paine's and Voltaire's. I am moreover prepared to prove that these latter works do not come within the law of indecency as defined by Mr. Rainsford.

The *Editor of the Mail*.—In reply to my opponent's argument I would say that he had better give up this debate and apologize to the audience. The facts cannot be concealed, and reams of paper and oceans of printer's ink cannot hide the deformity of my antagonist from view. I would recommend a little sack-cloth and ashes for him.

The chairman asked Mr. Grip if he would kindly sum up. The request was endorsed with great enthusiasm by the audience. Mr. Grip modestly complied, and rising in his place said:—

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen—The discussion we have just listened to requires no summing up. It must be manifest to all that the *Globe* man has been utterly routed by the clear logic of the cool, temperate and sensible reply of his adversary. I would call the attention of all students of logic to the masterly method of the affirmative argument. First, it is shown that there is a law against the admission of indecent books, or books containing indecency. Next, it is alleged that the books in question fall under that law, and the syllogism is perfect. In answer to this the gentleman on the negative says. (1) That these books are no more indecent than other books which his opponent would not exclude, and therefore ought not to be excluded if the others are admitted. (2) That he is prepared to prove they are not indecent at all, in the sense of indecency defined by the Rev. Mr. Rainsford, and therefore do not fall under the law. (3) He admits they are blasphemous and profane, and would fall under a law against Blasphemy and Profanity, but the law is against indecency only, and therefore does not exclude them. All this sounds logical, but mark the ability and sagacity with which it is met and squelched by the affirmative. In reply to the first syllogism, he calls upon the negative to give up the debate. And in reply to the other two propositions he exhausts the resources of logic by advising him to go and soak his head, or words to that effect. My decision is emphatically for the *Mail* man.

Tremendous applause (in the midst of which Mr. Grip woke up and found himself dozing at his fireplace with a *Globe* in one hand and a *Mail* in the other. "The whole thing was simply a dream!")



EVERYBODY IS WAITING FOR IT!

Grip's Great Comic Almanac for 1882 is on the way, and will arrive at all the bookstalls on or about Dec. 1st. Lay by a quarter and secure yourself a copy of the best book of humour ever issued in Canada.

A Mis-loading Newspaper.

"If you take a buckskin bag and put 100 eagles into it and shake or 'sweat' the bag for three hours, gold dust to the value of \$20 will be left in the bag, and no one will know the difference, unless the eagles are weighed."

My Dear Grip—I cut the above item from the London *Free Press*, and if I was behind the Editor with a red hot poker I would make a black burn on him for his idiotic suggestion—I would—by Josiah!

Not being able to catch 100 eagles, I put a couple of owls and a game cock into a bag, expecting at least ten cents of gold dust. I shook the bag steadily for about three hours, and when I opened it, instead of gold dust I found three dead birds and a heap of feathers!

I wish that Editor would not be so foolish as to suggest gold digging in this style. Perhaps, however, I ought to have had only eagles, but they cost about ten dollars each here, and a hundred of them would be a very expensive poultry yard.

Yours,
SIMPLE SIMON.



THE GLOBE'S COMMISSIONER TO IRELAND.

Voice from the Troubled Isle.—Arrah, be gorra! Hee's a man comin' to write our wrongs!



INJEWDICIOUS GOLDWIN.

Shade of B-knif-d.—What's the matter with you? Have you any goods in pawn?

Our Private Box.

At the Royal, Miss Cleves is appearing in "Only a Farmer's Daughter," which, despite its simple and rural title, turns out to be a most thrilling play, which is sure to please all who have a taste for literature such as Miss Bradon produces. Matinee Saturday. Next week the Star at this house will be Mr. Alex. Kaufman, (a son of Ex-Lt-Gov. Kaufman) who will appear in a new play, entitled "Lazare." His performance is highly applauded by the American critics, and the play itself is said to be unusually good.

At the Grand, Mr. John A. Stevens is now playing his popular drama, "Unknown," which is by no means unknown to Toronto audiences.

Dr. Lord's Biographical Lectures at Shaftesbury Hall are deeply interesting and instructive. For dates and particulars as to subjects, our readers are referred to the daily papers.

A Model Debate.

The other day Mr. Grip had the honour of receiving a circular to this effect:—

"The president and members of the John Locke Society for the Diffusion of Logic, request the pleasure of Mr. Grip's attendance at a special debate to be held at their rooms on the evening of — commencing at — o'clock."

At the appointed hour Mr. Grip proceeded to the place named, where he found a goodly company, fairly representative of the brains of Canada, gathered in comfortable anticipation of an intellectual treat. A tastefully printed programme was politely handed to each guest, and upon glancing at his, Mr. Grip was made aware that the subject to be discussed on this occasion was, "Resolved, that the seizure of the books of Paine and Voltaire, by the Custom