

A RESPECTED correspondent from Southampton, Ontario, after declaring that he was much interested in our late article on "Nelson in Quebec," adds that he would like to know where the Mr. SIMPSON, referred to in that article, died and where he is buried. Our correspondent suggests that he was buried in Montreal. Will Dr. MILES, or any of our Quebec antiquarians, kindly supply the answer?

OUR ILLUSTRATIONS.

THE MONUMENT OF MAISONNEUVE.—For particulars the reader is referred to our editorial columns.

ART STUDIES.—These pretty sketches are original, being taken from models in the Montreal School of Art and Design.

THE MASSACRE OF ISANDULA.—This frightful reverse to British arms has already been fully described in our columns. The sketch we present is drawn from the official British documents, and is a fearfully realistic picture of one of the darkest pages in England's military annals.

MCGILL UNIVERSITY CONVOCATION.—In connection with the Convocation of the Law and Medical departments of this national institution, our readers are presented with two views—one of the college buildings, as seen from the gates, and another of the scene in the William Molson Hall.

SCHOOL OF ART AND DESIGN.—This Provincial institution held its closing exercises on the 28th ult., and our sketch was taken on the spot by Mr. Jus. Weston, our artist, who is also a professor at the school. We have frequently explained and advocated the claims of this school to public patronage and shall continue to do so.

EASTER PICTURES.—As appropriate to the great Christian festival which we celebrate next Sunday, two artistic pictures are given—one representing the dolorous Good Friday scene, when Barabbas was preferred to the Saviour of mankind, and the other illustrative of the joyful event of the Resurrection.

INCIDENTS OF THE WEEK.—The central picture represents an effect of the weather on the 1st April, when, instead of the sunshine and balmy breezes of spring, which were naturally expected, we were treated to a blinding snow-storm. Many April fool tricks were played this year, but this was the best or worse, as everybody was taken in by it—except, of course, Mr. Vennor.—A sight to rejoice the heart or stomach of the gourmand is that of fat Easter beef and mutton after the long Lenten term.—There is a small sketch of Chief Penton's funeral, turning up Craig and passing up Bleury in front of our offices.—Mr. Wallace has capped the climax of his successes at the Academy of Music by the introduction of Salisbury's Troubadours, who played a week's splendid engagement, and whom we heartily recommend to our friends in every city and town of the Dominion which they may visit. Our sketch represents an arch scene of Rose Dimplecheek in that delightful medley "The Brook."—We give an interior view of Crescent Street Church during the closing exercises of the Montreal Presbyterian College. This fine institution is on the high way to prosperity, and is splendidly officered.

SAVING THE COLOURS.—We cannot better illustrate this heroic and historical event than by these spirited lines taken from the *Graphic*:

I.

'Twas the time of misty mornings at the opening of the year,
We crossed into the Zulu land and gave a British cheer,
We deemed the savage hordes could not our discipline withstand,
As we boldly went to meet them in their own barbaric land;
We talked of what we'd done before—and what again we'd do,
Although they were so many, and although we were so few,
For the glory of our colours filled each gallant soldier's breast,
And the one thought that we all thought was—to dare and do our best.

II.

We marched into the Zulu land, it might be miles a score,
We pitched our tents, and stood ready to fight one battle more;
One battle more! to most of us the last we were to fight,
For they came down in their thousands, each a giant in his might;
In thousands too we mowed them down—but still they came again—
Brave Melvill and poor Coghill were the last among the slain—
But they bore away our colours, as they pressed them to their breast,
Then died as should a soldier—having dared and done their best.

III.

We did not turn—but there we stood till every round was spent,
And every ball had told its tale until the last was sent,
And then to right, to left of us they closed—still ten to one,
As bravest mid the brave our gallant Colonel spiked the gun;
At eve, at wild Isandula, upon that fatal day,
Nine hundred British heroes stark beneath the moonlight lay,
And the one deed of the battle that will shine beyond the rest,
Was the saving of the Colours, found upon a hero's breast.

THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT.

(FROM OUR SPECIAL CORRESPONDENT.)

OTTAWA, April 5th, 1879.—It is almost impossible to convey to you the rage and disappointment which exist among the French members, in consequence of the announcement made by Sir John Macdonald, the leader of the Government, in the House of Commons on Thursday night. A similar statement was made in the Senate by the Hon. Mr. Campbell. The announcement made was evidently one that had been agreed upon between the Governor-General and his advisers, it being written. Sir John said: "I have to state that I waited on His Excellency the Governor-General, and informed him that after the resolution of the Senate last session, and that of the House of Commons during the present session, it was the opinion of His Excellency's advisers that 'the usefulness of Lieut.-Governor Letellier of Quebec was gone; and that it is in the public interest that he should be removed. His Excellency was thereupon pleased to state that, as the Federal system introduced by the Constitution of 1867 was until then unknown in Great Britain or her Colonies, there were no precedents to guide him, and as the decision in this case would settle for the future the relations between the Dominion and Provincial Governments as to the position of the Lieutenant-Governors, he therefore deemed it expedient to submit the advice, and the whole case, and the attendant circumstances, to Her Majesty's Government, for their consideration and instruction." I have thought it better thus to give you literally the written statement made by the Premier, as in the wild excitement which will be sure to come, it is better to bear in mind the exact issues thus officially made known between the Governor-General and his Ministers. The Opposition received the announcement with cheers—the Ministerialists with silence, with the exception of some hisses from the French benches.

The debate on the Tariff immediately went on, and continued until about midnight, when there came a new and very important phase. Mr. Ouimet moved the adjournment of the debate on the Tariff, stating that before the question of the tariff was settled, it was necessary to have an understanding as to what were the constitutional rights we possessed. He described the announcement made by the Premier respecting Mr. Letellier as startling, and went so far as to say that the rights of the people had been trampled on by the Governor-General, who had, in his opinion, acted in an unconstitutional manner. He contended squarely that the Governor-General had no right to refuse to act upon the advice tendered to him by his Ministers.

Sir John Macdonald immediately rose on Mr. Ouimet's sitting down, amid almost breathless silence, and stated with deliberation that constitutional rights had not been infringed; that there had not been a refusal of the advice tendered; that we were as much under Imperial authority as if we were in England; but he thought that the advice he and his colleagues had tendered to the Governor-General would have been at once accepted, when it was represented to him that it was for the benefit of the country Mr. Letellier should be removed; and he further expressed an opinion that the advisers of Her Majesty in England would agree with the Administration in this country.

Mr. Cockburn, an Ontario Conservative, and former Speaker, followed, supporting the view of Mr. Ouimet, and contending that as the Federal Government had the right of appointment of Lieutenant-Governors, it had, therefore, authority to dismiss them. He described the reference to England as a most unconstitutional act, and said he felt humiliated by the transaction. Mr. Vallée and Mr. Mousseau spoke in a similar strain; and Mr. Desjardins condemned the course adopted by the Governor-General, while he palliated it on the ground that His Excellency was a young statesman, and that it was natural for him to take counsel from the authorities in England. The House on this adjourned, the debate on the Tariff being suspended by Mr. Ouimet's motion.

There was a large Ministerial caucus yesterday, at which it was understood that a truce of some kind was agreed to. At any rate, the debate on the Tariff continued on Friday afternoon, without further interruption by the discussion of His Honour's case. But a notice of Mr. Mousseau appears for Monday for a motion declaring that the proposed reference to England is subversive of the principles of Responsible Government granted to Canada. This is simply a motion of want of confidence in the Government. The point is: how many of the French members will it detach from their party allegiance? I have heard not many.

It is rumoured, so great is the excitement and indignation among the French members, that some of them actually sent back invitations to dinner to Rideau Hall, which they had accepted. It is certainly to be hoped that this rumour is not well founded, for whatever allowance might be made for a step taken in passion, it would still be most unfortunate that the amenities of social life should be interrupted by matters which ought not to have, and really have not, any relation to them. If, in the opinion of these excited gentlemen, the Governor-General has erred, they surely cannot, at the worst, pretend that his error is more than an error of judgment; and it is, moreover, on the side of

prudence—or timidity, if they prefer it—on the part of a young statesman, seeking to be advised by his official superiors before taking what he believed to be a very important step.

As I see the situation presented by the facts I have stated—and I have given you all of them so far as they have transpired—it is one of the greatest interest, not to say of the greatest danger, for the political welfare of this country. Institutions such as ours cannot be worked without the exercise of great moderation, and nothing can be more illogical than the system of what is called "Responsible Government" with one or two views pushed to extremes. If, for instance, the advice tendered by Ministers must in all cases be considered absolute; if the representative of the Crown must have no controlling, modifying, or negative influence whatever, we have certainly a very showy, and very expensive paraphernalia for nothing. It would be very much simpler to have a big stamp in the hands of an official such as Mr. Himsforth, the Clerk of the Privy Council, with which he might affix the words "Sanctioned, V.R.," on all documents. Or, if, on the other hand, some ideas as respects personal government, which we have heard during these debates on the Letellier affair, were carried to their stern logical conclusion, there would certainly be very little use for the expensive luxury of what are called Ministers or advisers of the Crown, as just as many or perhaps fewer clerks would put into effect the ukases of personal authority. I say that what is called the British Constitution, or Responsible Government, if pushed on either hand to a logical extreme, either by the Ministers or the Crown, there would come a certain deadlock. And it is just because there have been moderation and forbearance on the part of the trained statesmen of the contending political parties in England, that free or Constitutional Government has survived there, while it has gone entirely to smash by pushing principles to logical extremes among the party passions which have been from time to time excited in France and elsewhere.

But why attack the Governor-General at all at this stage of the controversy? The Premier, Sir John Macdonald, remains in power, and so do all the Province of Quebec Ministers, and by remaining in power, they must, *ipso facto*, take the responsibility. This is an elementary truism that lies on the very surface. If Sir John Macdonald had resigned in the same way that Mr. Lafontaine and Mr. Baldwin did, when they fought their battle with Lord Metcalfe, we should have a clear understandable issue, as between the Governor-General and his advisers on Ministerial responsibility. But there is nothing of that sort. Sir John, I repeat, by remaining in, has assumed full constitutional responsibility for the act of His Excellency, and those who object to it should, to be logical under our system, pitch into him. It is surely a wild mistake to run foul of the Governor-General. It is, however, to be kept in mind, as Sir John stated, that there is really no decision yet. The Governor has only sought for further advice in a manner which Sir John Macdonald declares is quite constitutional; and the result of that may be the political decapitation of Mr. Letellier. I think, however, there will be difficulties, for I notice from the carefully-measured words of Sir John, in both his utterances, that he said nothing whatever about the angry issues involved in the discussion between Mr. Letellier and the DeBoucherville Ministry, nothing about unconstitutionality or anything of that sort; but simply that, after the resolutions that had been passed by the Senate and House of Commons, the usefulness of Mr. Letellier was gone, and, therefore, it was for the interests of the country to have him removed. The act of Mr. Letellier towards the DeBoucherville Ministry may have been, as alleged, both brutal and treacherous, and to my mind it did partake of both these qualifications; but then there is the question whether that act was not within his constitutional function, and, therefore, very difficult to deal with, especially in view of the fact that his Ministry, which assumes full responsibility for it, is still in power, and so sustained, after a general election on the issues involved, in the whole proceedings that led to the crisis.

With the exception of this very exciting interlude which occurred on Thursday night, the debate on the tariff has dragged its weary length along, and wholly occupied the attention of the House of Commons. I do not say there have not been some speeches of great ability on a matter touching the nearest interests of Canada; but I have in my former letters before given you the principles debated. There have been no new issues since; and I cannot attempt to follow the debate in detail in the space at my disposal.

Some of the questions before the Committees have had very great interest; and chief among these is the Coteau and Ottawa Railway Bill with its project to bridge the St. Lawrence. I have already told you that it is supported by leading Ottawa men, but is generally opposed by the interests of the Province of Quebec, and very strong representations have been made against it by deputations from Montreal, not based on local grounds, but on broad principles, affecting the whole Dominion. The most cogent argument on the part of these is that this bridging of the St. Lawrence is not necessary, and certainly there has been no attempt to show that it is by any trading interest of the Dominion, and further that its only use would be to feed some United States Railway lines to the injury of the existing Canadian railway

system. This certainly is not an interest for which we should run any risk of interrupting the navigation of a great river such as the St. Lawrence. Mr. Hickson, the Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, has written a powerful letter to Mr. M'Lennan, M.P., against the project from the standpoint of Canadian railway interests.

A Senate Committee has been examining into some of the Pacific Railway contracts, and have at least developed some remarkable discrepancies between estimates and results, the results being infinitely more expensive than the estimates. The investigation is going on.

Some further evidence has been taken before the Immigration Committee showing the wonderful richness of the soil of Manitoba, and the fact is that there now is a perfect rush from all parts of the Dominion to that Province. But those who are now going there are going too early, and they should be cautioned to wait until the roads are dried. There might be good sense on the part of those who went to take advantage of the snow roads to go to fixed destinations; but after the snow roads break up and before the ordinary roads of the country are dry, the mud is more sticky than bird lime and makes the roads utterly impassable. When dry, however, the roads become as hard and smooth as a billiard table. People should, therefore, be warned not to start now until warm weather comes. One fact was testified before the Committee, viz., that grass is now green in Manitoba, while we have here two or three feet of snow.

It is rumoured, and I believe correctly, that an Order in Council has been already passed to change the route of the Pacific Railway, and carry it south of Lake Manitoba instead of through the Narrows. This is a decision of vast importance for local interests in Manitoba and the colonists who have settled west of that Province; but according to Mr. Fleming it will make the Pacific Railway twenty miles longer.

HAVE DEAF-MUTES A CONSCIENCE?

In your issue of the 29th, under the caption of "Primitive Conscience," appears an article in which quotations of a startling nature are introduced, and upon a portion of which I would like, with your kind permission, to offer a few remarks.

There is especially one paragraph, to my mind, so erroneous that it should not be allowed to pass unnoticed. In the meantime some one better qualified may rise and explain more fully. The statement I have reference to is that which denies a primitive conscience to deaf-mutes. I assume that the authorities the author quotes in a vague enough way, must, when asserting that the "deaf and dumb comprehend neither law nor duty, neither justice nor injustice, neither good nor evil, neither vice nor virtue," have meant only such as, possessed of weak intellects unassisted by instruction, have gradually degenerated into a state bordering on idiocy.

Again, some teachers of the deaf and dumb, the better to show the prodigious transformation worked by their efforts, have oftentimes drawn inaccurate pictures of their untutored minds, almost pretending they had of brutes made men and, as it were, given them souls. It is a most deplorable error to imagine that the ordinary deaf-mute has, before receiving technical instruction, no intellectual idea, no notion of duty, no conception of right and wrong, and that his life is purely organic and animal. Must the deaf-mute, because of his physical defects, be brought below the level of the animal?

What is conscience? If it be the faculty by which we have ideas of right and wrong in reference to actions, then I affirm that a primitive conscience cannot be denied to the deaf-mute, for, apart from the fact that his mind does not differ from our own, he has, by compensation for certain privations, resources unknown to us, which, aided by the natural law that God has, I believe, implanted in every heart, enables him soon to form notions of right and wrong, which render him responsible for his actions, although obviously not to the extent of ordinary hearing persons.

Were I asked if a deaf-mute's knowledge of moral good and evil is innate or the result of external influence, I should—from my own experience and study, and from the fact that pantomimic instruction cannot impart moral sentiment, but only develop it—reply that the first principles of that limited knowledge must be engraven on his heart from the beginning, and form part of his moral nature. In this view I follow Abbé Lambert "de l'Institut Royal des S. M. de Paris," whose high personal attainments and long devotion to the cause of deaf-mute education render him competent authority in such matters. When a deaf-mute either steals, tells an untruth or offends against purity, he *knows*, or if you will, *feels* he has done something that his own natural lights (which are nothing less than the inspirations of conscience) tell him is improper, and the commission of any evil act is, with him as with other individuals, accompanied by remorse, unhappiness and regret. If this be not conscience, what is it?

PAUL DENYS.

Belleville, 2nd April, 1879.

M^{DLLE}. MARIANNE VIAEDOT, daughter of the celebrated M^{me}. Viardot Garcia, has made a very successful debut in Paris.