

recognition of the church as a kingdom upon earth. This seems to be not only impolitic, but even unchristian, because Christ declared that His kingdom is not of this world. But whether sound or unsound theologically, it is a menace to the stability of civil authority that citizens should be taught allegiance to any worldly sovereign except the sovereign of their own country. This objection lies partly to the temporal authority claimed by the church in the Papal States. This led to the armed intervention of foreigners in the internal affairs of Italy. It only indirectly affected us, but it had its manifestation in the organization of the Papal Zouaves, and more recently in the refusal of the Mayor of Montreal (in no offensive way, however) to receive an Italian naval commander, because he was the representative of a government that was supposed to be hostile to the temporal pretensions of the Pope. But the objection lies more forcibly to the claim of Catholic Christendom that the Pope ought to exercise authority over the kings and nations of the world. This is a claim no Protestant will ever admit, and it is something that the "laws of Great Britain" do not permit. Reasoning statesmen will consider it subversive of the undivided allegiance of citizens which is so essential to the stability of the state. The claim of a purely spiritual authority may be defended, and is even accepted by many Protestants in the spiritual domain, but the objection is radical when the allegiance claimed is to an earthly monarch, or to an earthly ecclesiastical organization which claims the right to make laws binding on citizens with even greater authority than the laws of their own country.

But the claim to temporal power has its practical, concrete effect in another direction that very deeply concerns all citizens. And this is what forms the basis of the pretensions now put forward by the advocates of separate schools. The church claims the right to levy taxes upon her people for church purposes, and to exempt them from the payment of taxes for the support of national schools. There is nothing to which modern Protestants have a more deeply-rooted hostility than to this. Church establishment exists in the United Kingdom; but the tocsin has sounded against the established church in Scotland and in Wales, and they are doomed. The church in England will speedily follow. I do not know of any new British community in which taxation for religious purposes is permitted, and it has been swept away in many places where it formerly existed. On the other hand, there is a determination on the part of the British people to control their national schools. It does not matter that taxes for Roman Catholic schools or churches are sought to be levied on Roman Catholics alone. Protestants dispute the right of the state to force even Catholics to pay for religious purposes under penalty of legal compulsion.

And what are the effects in Quebec of a system of ecclesiastical taxation? In every village and parish in Lower Canada there is one large, imposing and costly building, the Roman Catholic church, and in many cases no other good building in the whole parish. The country is impoverished by the assessments made for the construction of these churches, and the people possess few of the luxuries, and are deprived of many of the comforts, of life. And then, when it comes to the payment of

taxes for carrying on the government of the country, or to pay off provincial debts incurred by the vote of the majority, the Protestant or commercial minority is told that they must pay these, because they are rich, and because the majority have nothing to spare after meeting the exactions of the church. This is the reason why we find, in the Province of Quebec, that seventy per cent. of the taxes levied by the Provincial Government is collected from the City of Montreal, the principal centre of Protestant and commercial enterprise, while the population of Montreal is only about ten per cent. of the population of the Province, and its representation in the Legislative Assembly, only six members out of seventy-two. This is why, also, in the city of Montreal the taxes are levied more heavily on the St. Antoine and west wards, which contain most of the property owned by Protestants, although in the city council the St. Antoine Ward is represented by only two members, like the ward which contributes the least to the treasury.

The majority seem to have no compunctions about spoiling the Egyptians, and the minority are the Egyptians. A large number of streets have been widened in the city recently, and whereas in the other cases the city paid only half of the cost of the improvement, in the case of St. Lambert Street, which is being opened through the property of the nuns, from Notre Dame Street to the river front, the city is to pay the whole of the cost.

Even the courts of justice are not free from the influence of the spirit to which we have reference, and the Court of Review, presided over by a Protestant Chief Justice of the Superior Court, in a judgment from which there is no appeal, and dissented from by one of the judges, reverses a decision of expropriation commissioners, which gave full value to the Jesuit College of St. Mary's for land taken for the widening of Bleury Street, and awarded, in express terms, double the market value of the property taken, while no other person expropriated received anything but the real value.

There is among French Canadians a great deal of loyalty towards Canada, even towards Canada as a whole, but this is not what might have been expected if the guarantee of their separate schools and institutions was something to inspire gratitude. The French Canadians know well that the Canadians are hostile to their church privileges, and yet they are more loyal to Canadians, who would contest, than to Britain, which has guaranteed and secured them. It is the same in the United States. The United States has been pretty intolerant towards Roman Catholic and sectarian teaching, and still Roman Catholics, Irish and French Canadians, are even enthusiastically loyal towards the United States, while they are the reverse towards Britain, who has given them these privileges in Canada. From these circumstances the Canadians are learning the lesson that it does not pay to establish and preserve these special privileges, and they will not desire to extend them to the Western Provinces and Territories.

Now does this conflict with the statement with which we set out, that the British are more tolerant towards Roman Catholics, and allow greater religious freedom, than the Americans of the United States? Possibly it may. But it is probably more correct to say that the British democracy of to-day is more intolerant of any rival claim-

ant to the allegiance of the people, than the mixed aristocracy and democracy of the past. The true significance of the present statement, however, is to be found rather in the fact that the policy of the British Empire of to-day is that no part, not even the mother country, will interfere with any other self-governing part as regards local affairs. Great Britain will leave the control of this matter entirely to Canada. And if Canadians deem it impolitic to allow church schools to be supported by state taxes, or if Canadians consider that all citizens must contribute to the support of national schools, no other British country will claim the right to interfere. If British connexion was of a nature to curb our local autonomy, the most intensely British of our people would not desire to perpetuate it. But their conviction being that it curbs neither local autonomy nor full development in any legitimate direction, but rather forms the safeguard of these rights, they are determined that British connexion shall not cease.

We have said that the French Canadians educated in the schools of Quebec are composed of two classes. We have referred already to the class which gives allegiance to the church the first place in their affections. The other class that predominates among those educated in these schools do not give the church the first place. To this class belong such men as the great Louis Joseph Papineau, Eric Dorion, Joseph Doutre, Rodolphe Laflamme, and the whole rank and file of the Rouge party, with a large number of those who have become Protestants. What are the national sentiments that prevail among them? They have resisted the claims of the church to their first allegiance. Do they accept the national sentiments of the majority of the people of Canada? It will hardly be disputed that the English-speaking Canadians have been, by a vast majority, thoroughly British in sentiment. Are the French Rouges in sympathy with them? Not at all. These men look for their heroes, not to British history, nor to British Canadian history, but to George Washington, Lafayette, and the American Revolutionists, whose great virtues were that they repudiated their indebtedness to the British Empire for the defence and extension of their country, and cast off their British allegiance. The members of this party eulogize the leaders of the Lower Canadian Rebellion, erect monuments to Chenier, glorify Desorimier; their sons lay plots to dynamite the statue of Nelson. Their leading poet is a laureate of France, an enemy of England. When Mr. Laurier seeks for a hero, whom does he select? It is the undeniably great and noble Abraham Lincoln, but it is an American, not a British, patriot. And he has sadly misread the great life purpose of his hero, which was to preserve the union of all the States forming the Empire to which he owed allegiance, while Mr. Laurier would have Canada play the role of the South, and secede from the union to which her allegiance binds her. And thus Mr. Laurier goes about from place to place insidiously sowing the seeds of disaffection and disruption, proclaiming that whenever the interests of England and Canada come into conflict he will decide for the interests of Canada. Why should he suggest any such conflict of interests, unless he wishes to take advantage of it to justify secession? The French Canadian Protestants, again, when they find it may be uncomfortable for them at home, by reason of their change of religion, where do they go? Is it to Ontario,