

any other kind, pays us so poor a compliment that we scarcely care to discuss the matter with him. None the less, we recognize that Mr. Evans has rendered a service to Canada by traversing Mr. Glen's argument, point by point, and showing its striking lack of information in some important respects and its utter lack of conclusiveness in every respect. This is done with marked ability, and, we are glad to add, with a pleasing and creditable absence of the unfriendly *animus* towards neighbors whom our relations should be those of cordial friendship and good-will which sometimes mars such discussions. Without agreeing with the writer at every point, we commend the article to both Canadian and American readers.

The address of Hon. H. G. Joly, before the Young Men's Liberal Club, on Monday evening, was an event of some importance, especially in its bearing upon the relations of the majorities in Ontario and Quebec to each other. That there is just now, and has been for some time past, a somewhat dangerous tendency towards alienation of the two races is unhappily but too obvious. Mr. Joly came avowedly as a messenger of peace. The main object of his address was to convince his hearers that the majority in Quebec are not unfair to the minority. If his argument was not convincing at all points, it certainly was well adapted to remove some erroneous impressions, and, let us hope, to take the edge off some keen prejudices. It is unnecessary to add that it was conceived and delivered in the honest, frank, straightforward style for which Mr. Joly is so justly celebrated. It is no small honour to the French-Canadian race to have produced such a man. It would be easy, we are inclined to think, to show good reason for dissent from some of the assumptions on which his arguments were based, and an agreement on principles is essential to the convincing force of an argument. For a Liberal, especially a Canadian Liberal, he seems strangely content with the relations between church and state, and between priest and people, which seem to Ontario onlookers like two great mill-stones hung upon the necks of the French Catholics. But that, he would no doubt say, and say with truth, is a subject with which the Province alone can deal. Any reform of those matters must come from within, not from without the Province. And yet whatever retards the prosperity and progress of Quebec, injures the whole Dominion. On the whole, Mr. Joly's visit was a noble and, let us hope, not wholly unsuccessful effort to promote harmony between the two races and religions—an attempt which must have the sympathy of every true Canadian. It is most unfortunate and humiliating that for every admitted failure in fairness and tolerance on the part of French-Canadian Catholics, an effective *tu quoque* was at hand in the shape of a simple allusion to the P. P. A.

The recent visit of Lord and Lady Aberdeen to this city and other places in the west reminds us once more of the evident sincerity and heartiness with which their Excellencies are throwing themselves into the currents of Canadian life. That it is a mark of true art to conceal art is a saying so commonly received that it has almost passed into a proverb. Similarly it might be said that it is characteristic of genuine rank that those who come in contact with it lose the embarrassment which they might be supposed to feel in its presence. We doubt, however, the correctness of either criterion, unless taken in a higher than the common acceptation. True art does not conceal art because it has no art to conceal. It knows nothing of the thing meant by this ambiguous word as used in the second place in the popular expression. It is natural, unstudied, genuine throughout. So the true aristocracy dispels the consciousness of social inferiority in others by its own elevation above mere artificial distinctions, and the genuineness of its own personal interest in the concerns of our common humanity. Those who are familiar with the records of our present Governor-General and his noble-minded wife will readily, we believe, accord them the highest of all tributes, that of a hearty recognition of the fact that their cordiality in the discharge of their public and social functions springs not simply from a sense of official duty, nor yet from the instinctive feeling implied in *noblesse oblige*, but from a higher motive than even that of the noble old Roman, who declared in words that have become immortal, his readiness as a man to identify himself with whatever pertained to the well-being of the human family—a motive higher because exalted by Christian principle of which the Roman knew nothing. That this higher idea of duty and service is being transmitted to their children is very pleasingly manifested in the way in which Lady Marjorie Gordon is identifying herself with the children of Canada, through the medium of the little magazine by means of which she is entering into communication with them.

The agitation for the disallowance of the North-West School Ordinance seems to have been a case of much ado about nothing. Not a few, we dare say, had the idea that the law in question was somewhat similar to that which has created so much discussion in Manitoba, virtually, if not specifically, doing away with the Separate School system. Such persons must have been surprised to learn from the report of the Committee of the Privy Council that the ordinance in question, on the contrary, distinctly provides for the establishment of Separate Schools, either Catholic or Protestant, in any organized school districts in which a minority of the rate-payers may choose to establish such schools. It further provides, strange to say, that "in such case, the

rate-payers establishing such Protestant or Roman Catholic school shall be liable only to assessments of such rates as they impose upon themselves in respect thereof." As it is further stated in a subsequent clause that the Separate School districts thus established shall not only "possess and exercise all rights, powers and privileges," but shall be "subject to the same liabilities and method of government," provided in respect of Public School districts, and as one of the regulations for the government of the schools provides that no religious instruction shall be given from the opening of the school in the morning until one-half hour previous to the closing in the afternoon, it may be that this latter limitation is that relied on by the petitioners to establish their complaint that the law deprives the Separate Schools of their religious character as such. The report of the Committee shows pretty clearly, by quoting the actual provisions of the ordinance, that other complaints of the petitioners, in respect to the regulations governing the qualifications of teachers, uniformity of text-books, etc., are really groundless. On the whole, most non-Catholic and perhaps many Catholic readers will be likely to think that the mistake of the Northwest law-makers was in providing at all for the perpetuation of the illogical Separate School system. It would be pretty safe to predict that with the increase of population much more radical changes in the school laws will be demanded before many years.

The immense audiences crowding to hear Irving, Patti, and other artists in Toronto, on the one hand, and liberal collections at such meetings as those of the Missionary Convention, on the other, prove that there is plenty of money in the city, and no lack of disposition to spend it on such objects as commend themselves to the tastes or consciences of those who have it. The statements of such deputations of respectable citizens as that which waited on the Mayor a few days since to ask for opportunity to earn bread for themselves and their families, makes it equally certain that there is no small amount of destitution, amounting in some cases to actual want of food, in this same city. These two things—wealth and want, luxurious living and semi-starvation—ought not to co-exist in a civilized and Christian community. What is to be done? All are agreed that any help provided should take the shape of honest pay for honest work. Who shall provide the work and who shall pay for it? "The City Council through taxation of citizens," say Alderman Lamb and others. We do not say that they are wrong. There is very much to be said in favour of their proposition. But the objections are many and weighty. Is there no better way? Can there be the slightest doubt that there are thousands, tens of thousands, in Toronto who would be glad to give, some more, some less, according to their several abilities, could they but be