

WHOSE IS "THE FALLACY"?

To the Editor of THE WEEK:

SIR,—While the six letters I had written on the position of the "English Minority in Quebec" were in course of publication it seemed better not to divert the attention of readers from the main argument by discussing any side issues which the criticism of those who differ from me might open up; now, however, I may explain more fully any disputed points; for I cannot hope to have written at length upon subjects of so much importance without laying myself open to objections more or less serious; all I can be sure of is that I have spared no pains to discover the truth and to state it to the utmost extent of my power.

I did not expect, however, to have a patent fact of Canadian history challenged. That it was the Protestants who abolished the provision for a Protestant clergy made by Imperial Acts—that this abolition was effected by a union of both political parties after an appeal to the country, and that the Roman Catholics held aloof from the agitation which compelled abolition, seemed to me elementary facts known to all. That any serious parallel could be drawn between the secularization of the Clergy Reserves in Canada and the combination of Irish Catholics and Dissenters which broke up the Irish Establishment shows how quickly myth will, in times of excitement, gather round the most evident facts.

The most succinct statement of the causes which resulted in the secularization of the Clergy Reserves is given in a letter written from Toronto, on July 12th, 1851, by Lord Elgin, then Governor-General, to Earl Grey, the Colonial Secretary. It reads as follows:—

"As to the insinuation that the movement against the endowments of the Church of England is prompted by the Romans, events will give the lie to it ere long. The following facts, however, seem to be wholly irreconcilable with this hypothesis. Before the union of the Provinces there were very few, if any, Roman Catholic members in the Upper Canada Parliament; they were all powerful in the Lower. Now it is recorded in history that the Upper Canadian Legislative Assembly kept up year after year a series of assaults on the 'Clergy Reserves'; in proof of which, read the narrative part of the Address to Her Majesty on the 'Clergy Reserves' from the Legislative Assembly last year. And it is equally a fact that the Lower Canadian Legislative Assembly never meddled with them, except, I think, once when they were invited to do so by the Government." (Walrond—Letters of Lord Elgin, p. 139.)

The address Lord Elgin referred to is only one of a long series of documents of the same nature extending over many years. This one recites the whole history of the agitation without referring to the Roman Catholics or to Lower Canada, and sums up as follows:—

"That it appears from the facts above stated, that during a long period of years, and in nine successive sessions of the Provincial Parliament, the representatives of the people of Upper Canada, with an unanimity seldom exhibited in a deliberative body, declared their opposition to religious endowments of the character above referred to."

These endowments were secured by an Imperial Act, which it was necessary to have repealed before legislation could take place in Canada, and feeling rose very high. The editor of Lord Elgin's letters says (p. 135):—

"So violent was the feeling that it threatened to sweep away at one stroke all the endowments in question without regard to vested interests, and without even waiting for the repeal of the Imperial Act by which these endowments were guaranteed. More loyal and moderate counsels however prevailed, owing chiefly to the support which they received from the Roman Catholics of Lower Canada."

The Lower Canadian French were willing to join in asking the Imperial Government to relegate the question to the Canadian Parliament; but Sir Francis Hincks ("Religious Endowments" and "Life") informs us that they would go no further, being opposed to secularizing the Reserves. He says (p. 73): "There never had been any difference of opinion on the Clergy Reserve question among the Upper Canada members of the (Lafontaine-Baldwin) Government; but the time had arrived when it was necessary to come to an understanding with the Lower Canadians." Sir Francis, whose whole political career had been aimed to that end, formed the Hincks-Morin Government in 1851 and he says ("Life" p. 342) that he "succeeded in having secularization made a Cabinet question." This was done by holding out to Lower Canada the abolition of the Seigniorial tenure. With these two questions—the Clergy Reserves for Upper Canada and the Seigniorial Tenure for Lower Canada—the Ministry appealed to the country; for the franchise had been greatly enlarged and it was not thought constitutional to settle such great questions in a House elected on a narrower franchise. The verdict was overwhelming upon the Clergy Reserves; but party intrigues defeated the Hincks-Morin Cabinet on the election of Speaker and a Coalition Ministry was formed by Sir Allan McNab (McNab-Morin), and both Liberals and Conservatives united upon these two measures as a basis. Both the great political parties were thus pledged to deal finally with the question.

The extreme left of the Liberal party disapproved of the coalition and thirty-eight members protested against it. These formed a new party, called "Rouges" in Lower Canada and "Clear Grits" in Upper Canada. These names were invented by their antagonists, and, though scarcely fair, they clung to them. I may therefore be excused for employing these terms as the new ministry

had appropriated both of the old party names. The "Clear Grit" party included the Hon. George Brown, Wm. Lyon Mackenzie, Dr. Rolph, Mr. Hartman and others, all of whom were greater enemies of Church endowments than the ministerialists; so that upon the principle of secularization the Protestants were almost unanimous.

The new House consisted of 130 members, of whom fifty-one were Roman Catholics and seventy-nine Protestants. Mr. E. S. Hemming, who has challenged the accuracy of my statements, considers that the help of the Catholics was necessary to secure the abolition of the clergy reserves; therefore, in order to simplify the question, I will eliminate the Roman Catholics and deal only with the seventy-nine Protestant members and their action in regard to this single measure.

The first trial of strength was upon the sixth paragraph of the Address. This stated that "as from an early period in the history of Upper Canada this provision, which was originally intended for the support of the Protestant faith, has been a source of discord and agitation in that section of the province, we consider it most desirable, in the interest of religion and social harmony, that a final and conclusive settlement of the long pending controversy should take place without delay." The Opposition moved, in amendment, to substitute "secularization of the Clergy Reserves" for "final and conclusive settlement," and sought thus to lead the House to the principle of complete secularization. The amendment was lost on a division of 17 to 41 (Protestants). Upon the second reading there was a division on the principle of the whole Bill "as a violation of the vested interests acquired by the Churches of England, Scotland and other denominations." The amendment was lost on a vote of 11 to 50 (Protestants), and this result indicates the strength of the feeling among Protestants upon the principle. The divisions in Committee on the Bill were of course on matters of detail, the chief subject of dispute being that the Ministry were desirous of commuting for a fixed sum all stipends then chargeable, and thus saving some small amount for religious purposes; while the Opposition wanted to secularize the whole capital and to pay the stipends during the existing incumbencies only. Other amendments in details there were, too tedious to specify, but all were lost on divisions (counting Protestants alone) as follows: 12 to 54; 6 to 62; 18 to 51; 22 to 44; 26 to 41; 10 to 49; 14 to 56; 5 to 50; 5 to 53; 25 to 29; 22 to 45; 26 to 40; 3 to 58; 4 to 59; 22 to 39; 22 to 30; 27 to 33; 3 to 48; 9 to 43; 3 to 44; 4 to 41. So the Ministry might have carried their measure without amendment through Committee if there had been no Catholics in the House. The divisions on the third reading were as follows: That the Bill be read a third time, 35 to 18. A motion to add a clause, as to mode of division among municipalities, 26 to 25; that the Bill do pass, 37 to 21. In all these divisions Protestant votes alone are counted. The principle was affirmed as has been shown on the second reading by 50 to 11. The final vote was 37 to 21.

In all these divisions the Catholics, whom I have left out of the count, of course voted with the English parties with which they were in alliance; and at page 231 of Turcott's *Le Canada sous l'Union* will be found the reason (translated) as follows:—

"The members from Lower Canada supported the Ministerial measure with a view to carrying out the wishes of the people of Upper Canada. M. Cartier (Sir George) reminded the Opposition that the question of secularizing the Clergy Reserves had not been raised by the Catholics of Lower Canada; but by the great Protestant majority of the other province. The responsibility for that measure must be attributed to that majority. The last election had demonstrated that secularization was a popular idea with the population of Upper Canada. If they had not sent to Parliament a crushing majority in favour of secularization, Catholics would not have voted for the measure." As it was, the majority of the Catholic members voted with the Government to secure some small fragments of the wreck to the English and Scotch churches. The so-called "Rouges" voted with the "Clear Grits," to secularize the whole.

It is important to observe in this connection that the Roman bishops never complained of these endowments, nor were any petitions got up, nor any agitation raised about them, in Lower Canada. It was clearly against the principles of the Roman Church to advocate openly or covertly any principles of secularization. On the contrary, Lord Elgin's opinion was justified by the fact that the whole Roman Catholic Episcopate addressed a memorial to the Government on the 4th of June, 1854, against the secularization of the Protestant Clergy Reserves. Every bishop of the Arch-diocese of Quebec, then extending over all of old Canada, signed it. It contained the following remarkable sentence:—"We venture then to express a hope that the destination of the Reserves may not be altered, or that, at the least, to remove all cause of reasonable apprehension, the proceeds thereof may be divided among the different religious bodies in proportion to the number belonging to each communion."

The friends of the Protestant endowments made two attempts in committee to do this and to divide them among the different Protestant bodies, but both propositions were voted down by the Protestant members in divisions of 50 to 10 and 57 to 14. I feel much indebted to Mr. Hemming for having challenged the accuracy of my statement, for I did not know before that the Bishops of the Roman Church had interceded that the endowments of the Protestant Clergy should be maintained. To see a

thing like that done one must, after all, come to the so-called "narrow," "bigoted," "intolerant" Province of Quebec. I do not remember reading of anything parallel to it having occurred elsewhere. Not certainly in Ireland, as Mr. Hemming's theory would imply. It seems to me, therefore, that it is he who is scattering fallacies. I would not have gone so fully into details, but for the danger of allowing such a distortion to go uncontradicted. It is started now for the first time, and if it were once to get adrift upon the platform it would soon harden into a fixed idea very difficult to dislodge.

S. E. DAWSON.

Montreal, Feb. 20, 1890.

ART NOTES.

THE wordy war between Pennell and Henry Blackburn still goes on, a letter from the former claiming priority for the French illustrated catalogues of art exhibitions over Mr. Blackburn's "Academy Notes" being the last shot fired. It is now Mr. Blackburn's innings.

DELAROCHE's famous picture of Cromwell, which was lent by the city of Nismes to the late Paris Exhibition, has been badly injured by rain during its return journey, as by some mistake it was sent to Aix and delayed on the road. The civic authorities of Nismes have entered suit to recover damages against the railroad.

It is a sign of the times that the "line engraving" again provoked no competition in the schools of the English Royal Academy. Its place has been taken by easier and more artistic methods of work, and it would be well if the Academy would throw the competition open to etchers and mezzotinters as well as to engravers in the pure line.

MR. JOHN A. FRAZER, erstwhile a dweller in our midst and a member of the Royal Canadian Academy, is meeting with good success in New York, where he is a member of the American Water Colour Society, although none of his works appear in the current exhibition for the reason that he is under agreement to Messrs. Knoedler and Company, successors to Goupils, who take from him all his productions both in oil and water-colours.

We learn that Mr. G. A. Reid's picture "A Story," that was noticed last week, has been purchased by Mr. E. B. Osler for the amount of one thousand dollars, and that he has consented to allow Mr. Reid to exhibit the picture at the Paris Salon. It is an encouraging fact for our artists to note that a really good picture can so readily find a purchaser at a fair price in Toronto, and that we have among our wealthy citizens some who are not afraid to invest in Canadian works of art. In this case we think both artist and patron are to be congratulated.

In the Winter Exhibition of the English Royal Academy the twelve specimens of Joshua Reynolds are much admired. Especial interest attaches to the unfinished portrait of Mrs. Payne Galloway, whom Sir Joshua afterwards painted in the celebrated "Pig-a-back" portrait, where she is represented carrying her child on her back in a park. The unfinished head shows the master's manner of work from the beginning, as it is a two hours' sketch with some umber rubbed in for background. Although painted a hundred years it is still fresh and perfect, even the carnations remaining unchanged, which is rarely the case with Reynolds' paintings. Among the others of his hand are "Hope Nursing Love" and "Viscountess St. Asaph and Child," both well-known and often copied pictures.

In the American Water Colour Society's Exhibition now open, J. G. Brown, of street-boy fame, has only one picture representing one of his favourite shoeblack boys standing at a "Poor Corner." Bolton Jones has two of his charming out-door studies, "Autumn" and "Early Winter." F. S. Church has "A Cold Wave," one of his fanciful pictures of bears coming down from the north to fan a drowsy young damsel on the sea-shore. De Thulstrup, clever and dashing as usual, has two bits of Russia, "A Moujik" and "Troika." H. Farrar, the late secretary, has seven of his well-known style, chiefly calm, quiet twilight and evening scenes, placid water, thin, leafless thready trees, all as of old. C. W. Eaton and C. H. Eaton have between them fourteen landscapes of fields, trees and streams, all clever, striking and very much alike. W. Hamilton Gibson has thirteen all to himself, also very clever and striking and also very much alike. One of the most striking and important works is "The Heyday of Youth," by that masterly draughtsman, Wm. Magrath, representing Greek maidens at a fountain. This drawing is severely classical, well composed, broad and effective. J. F. Murphy has three "impressions," clever but peculiar as of old. T. Mower Martin's "On the Wing," representing homing pigeons, is marked *sold*, a sure sign of appreciation. Horatio Walker, another Torontonion, has a good effective "Evening" with a flock of sheep pasturing among the snowy fields, also a "Peasant Woman Baking Bread," and "A Barnyard." Jervis McEntee's "Northern Winter" is of course good but not of his best. Bruce Crane, W. L. Sonntag, D. W. Tryon, Alfred Jones (brother of Bolton), Ross Turner, M. F. H. De Haas, Arthur Partyn and the Morens all are unmistakably there, and altogether the exhibition is a thoroughly characteristic one, with perhaps a trifle of sameness and repetition of style, manner and subject. TEMPLAR.