

GRIP.

EDITED BY MR. BARNABY RUDGE.

The grabeſt Beaſt is the Aſs; the grabeſt Bird is the Owl;
The grabeſt Fiſh is the Onyſter; the grabeſt Man is the Fool.

TORONTO, SATURDAY, JUNE 17TH, 1876.

Don't forget it.

GRIP, who of course has the liveliest interest in everything which is calculated to make Toronto a refined and intelligent city, has special pleasure in reminding his readers of the Exhibition of the Ontario Society of Artists, now open in their handsome new building on King Street. All day long the room is thronged with patrons, and a susceptible fellow can't help envying the pictures that have the honour of being long and fondly gazed upon by some of the prettiest of our city belles. The paintings are highly creditable as a whole, and show a constant progress in our Canadian art instincts. The pictures are not quite so pointed as GRIP'S own productions, but they are prettier to look at. Mr. GEORGE BROWN and Sir JOHN can gaze on those in the exhibition with impunity, yea, even with pleasure, whereas it is known that they cannot always examine GRIP'S with similar feeling. We will have something more to say next week.

GRIP would affectionately advise the *Globe* to send for Mr. EDWARD JENKINS whenever it contemplates writing an allegory. If that popular author had been entrusted with the task of misrepresenting Sir ALEX. GALT, he would have made a better fist of it than did the writer of the stupid and far-fetched "Satire" which appeared in the *Globe* of last week under the head of "A True Story." GRIP has endeavoured patiently and studiously to discover the interpretation of that fatwitted effusion, and he arrives at the following several conclusions:

1. "Jack Rouge," the little Slave boy who sighed for liberty, and attempted to secure it, is identical with the Liberal Catholics of Quebec.
2. "Alexander Anglo-Bleu," the cruel and tyrannical master of this slave who flogged him for these incipient desires for freedom, is Sir A. T. GALT.
3. "Joe," the son of "Alexander Anglo-Bleu," whom the latter, while larruping the nigger, asked to "go and tell yer mother to come and stop me thrashing Jack" is intended for—Archbishop LYNCHE.
4. Lastly, there is the wife of Alexander Anglo-Bleu, which fictitious character in this allegory is identical with—give it up.

Now let us try and apply this figurative "True Story." Is it true that Sir A. T. GALT did, at any time, oppose the efforts of Liberal Catholics to free themselves from the tyranny of the Church, exercised in matters which according to sound doctrine, are outside of the church's province? Is it fair to use the word *Rouge*, which is known to mean nothing more than French Grit, to describe the Liberal Catholics? It is true that Sir A. T. GALT has, as a conservative, fought against "*Jack Rouge*," meaning the French Grits, or Liberals or Reformers, politically so called. But the question is, is a French Grit necessarily a Liberal Catholic? Is a *Rouge* necessarily a Liberal Catholic? Is a Catholic "Liberal," (*alias* Grit) necessarily a Liberal Catholic. Are there no Frenchmen in Quebec who hold conservative views in politics, and Liberal views in religion? The *Globe* for present purposes, assumes that because Sir A. T. GALT opposed French Liberals in religion, therefore he is inconsistent in espousing the cause of Religious Liberals *now*. This would be logical and true if Liberal Catholics and Grit Catholics were one and the same party. But are they? "Alexander Anglo-Bleu" shamefully flogged "Jack Rouge" in past years; granted. Now to conclude the matter, who is "Jack Rouge." He is a French member of a *political* party which is called Liberal; but he may at the same be the veriest slave and contented bondman of his teachers in things religious.

Let us say for arguments sake that the word *Rouge* stands for "French Catholic who believes, in civil liberty and disbelieves in church and State."

Well in the army Sir A. T. GALT fought against in olden times there were doubtless many "Rouges." Also many "Rouges" stood shoulder to shoulder with Sir A. T. GALT in those battles. They were purely political fights, and Rouges who held Tory views in politics were fighting Rouges who held grit views. Those fights are long past. Sir A. T. GALT has long since hung up his sword as a purely political warrior. His position is plainly this whatever party organs may say to obscure or misrepresent it. He observes that the question of church and state far transcends in importance the question of mere politics and he calls upon all "Rouges" (as we are understanding that name) to come out of the ranks of Grit and Tory and join in a solid body to assert the faith they hold in common on this Church and State question. And further he calls upon all protestants (for all protestants are supposed to be opposed to the Vatican doctrine of Church and State) he calls upon all protestants to come and stand beside this solid body of their Catholic fellow citizens who in that grave matter believe with them.

The "Times" and Historicus on Canadian Shipping.

HISTORICUS.

It seems to be some one's opinion
That our home Shipping Acts, do you see,
Over-rule those made in the Dominion;
But extremely mistaken is he.

For the Act of their Confederation
They say gave them exclusive right,
And abolished our home domination;
But that is erroneous quite.

I allow the word "exclusive's" there, sir,
It's presence I can't but admit,
But your interpretation wont bear, sir
No, this is the meaning of it.

Each Province at that time combining
Shipping Laws to enact had a right,
That right by this Act they, resigning,
The Dominion gave, "exclusive" quite.

It excluded each Province from making,
Shipping Laws for themselves any more;
But can't hinder Great Britain from taking
The rights she had always before.

Then the Act of the year sixty-nine, sir,
Lets them manage their own coasting trade,
A thing 'twas no use to define, sir
If before they the power had swayed.

And of coinage the very same thing, sir,
As our Act passed in Seventy shows
So you need not such arguments bring, sir,
Nor any such nonsense propose.

THE "TIMES"

Yes, quite an elaborate letter,
Historicus writes, but its bosh.
And he don't make the case a bit better
For those who'd the colonies squash.

Of course 'twas the Board of Trade ruling,
As their President, ADDERLEY, said;
But the man must be good at self-fooling,
Who relies upon ADDERLEY'S head.

There's MACKENZIE and MILLS, you will find, sir,
Two great Clear Grit Canadian chaps,
Have declared that the right we resigned, sir,
And they'll soon give Sir CHARLES some hard raps,

Why that Act of the year Sixty-nine, sir,
Was a blunder; we'd given them then
All the rights they demand in that line, sir,
And it coolly conferred them again.

And the same with your Coin Legislation
They make coin for themselves over there.
And if you make the least demonstration
To meddle, I tell you they'd stare.

Let Historicus note now this fact, meant,
The real position to show
Ours can't override their enactment.
We resigned all that right long ago.

Those rights, to the Colonies granted
We cannot attempt to withdraw
And we scarce should succeed, if we wanted
To manage Canadian Law.

The Dominated One.

It was Sir ALEXANDER GALT who most unceasingly,
Of Papal domination and tyrannic priests did cry,
And knew the Pope would ruling soon in Ottawa be found,
And kicking of LORD DUFFERIN promiscuously around,

And every night he dreams he's caught by persecuting foes,
And if his gout should twinge he's sure they've thumbscrews on his toes.
Can't eat his meals. This morning, asked a mutton-chop to take,
He could'nt touch it; it was so suggestive of a stake.

But GRIP will tell the mournful knight to be of better cheer,
For GRIP provides an amulet that all his foes shall fear.
Two dollars only does he as remuneration seek,
For which he'll yearly keep him safe with fresh ones every week.