

But if it be our happy lot, as indeed it may be if we live aright, to have that honour, love, obedience, those troops of friends which should accompany old age, of what shall we be able to complain? Troops of friends! What mirth, and laughter and music, and deep tranquil joy lie hidden in those words! Who could be unhappy in such way surrounded, living in the hearts of friends, and even when covered by the shadows of the night, still living, like the memory of sweet music? One could then say, with old Horace, as the Lamp of Life flickers:

Exegi monumentum aere perennius
Regalique situ pyramidum altius
Non omnis moriar! multa pars mei
Vitat Libitinam.

Non omnis moriar? I shall not all die; the oblivion of the grave will not envelop all, the memory of me will be like the winds from Araby blowing over the Garden of Spices, giving and receiving odours!

THINGS IN GENERAL.

ON SHAKING HANDS.

Let us consider the value of our digital arrangements with reference to the venerable custom of "shaking hands." The classification is numerically significant of the varieties in the act itself. First, there is the one-finger variety, significant of extreme condescension and high-mightiness. When an exalted individual permits you his forefinger, he distinctly says, semaphorically, that you must not presume on the slightest familiarity. Your are in the presence of Augustus, and the delicate little ceremony is intended to impress you with the important fact. Then there is the two-fingered variety. This is condescension also, but of a milder type. It is leavened with a touch of kindness. Still you must not presume. This variety is much affected by aged parsons and other venerable by-gones to their parishioners and dependants, old uncles to their nephews and nieces, and so on. The three-fingered sort adds another increment of favour, condescension having almost vanished but not quite. Much, however, depends on the vitality of the touch. If alive and conscious, it may be almost friendly. If flabby, do not trust it. Talking of flabby hand-shaking seems slightly contradictory, for no possible shake, not to say shock, can come out of such a salute. In its perfection the flabby sort consists of all four fingers laid together, and held forth with about the same amount of significance as the paw of a rabbit or the fin of a sea-dog. The correct way of meeting this variety is by accepting it in precisely the same style. Two flat four-fingered fins thus meeting must be thrilling in the extreme. But when the flat sort is moreover clammy, it is the very abyss of cold-blooded formality absolutely insulting, not to say sickening, in its very touch.—*Social notes.*

ORIGIN OF THE UNION JACK.

Before the crowns of England and Scotland were united under James I., the flag carried by English ships was white, with the red cross of St. George emblazoned on it; and that hoisted on board the ships of Scotland was blue with the cross of St. Andrew on it; the red lines of the first being perpendicular and horizontal, those of the latter diagonal. Some differences having arisen between the ships of the two countries, His Majesty, to prevent this in future, and to teach his people that they formed one nation, ordained that a new flag should be adopted, having the cross of St. George interlaced with that of St. Andrew on the blue ground of the flag of Scotland. All ships were to carry it at the main-masthead, but the English ships were to display the St. George's red cross at their sterns, and the Scottish that of St. Andrew. On April 12, 1606, the Union Jack was first hoisted at sea, but it was not till the Parliamentary union of the two countries in 1707 that it was adopted as the military flag of Great Britain. Both services, therefore, now use it as the national banner.—*Antiquary.*

WOMEN IN PARLIAMENT.

It is recorded that among the persons returned to the Parliament of 1361 (35 Edward III.) were "Marie, Countesse de Norff; Alianor, Countesse de Ormond; Philippa, Countesse de Atholl." In the preceding year, also, there had been writs tested at Roynton, on April 5, issued to divers earls, bishops, and to four abbesses, requiring their attendance at Westminster on the morrow of the Trinity, for the purpose of treating of an aid for the making the king's eldest son a knight, etc. It does not appear, however, that any ladies ever actually took their seats in Parliament by virtue of these summonses; but there are numerous instances on record of both squires and knights having sat in the House of Lords in right of their wives.—*Fireside.*

LAW OF GRAVITATION.—If Sir Isaac Newton had been in the Garden of Eden with our first parents, the law of gravitation might have been discovered soon after the creation,—not, indeed, by the simple fact that an apple fell from a tree, but by observing how quickly Adam fell when the apple struck him.—*Baxter.*

PATRIOTISM.

Protean Selfishness puts on no guise
More apt than "Patriotism" to blind our eyes:
Shall Briton, Frenchman, Russ, American,
Glory in things that would disgrace a man?
Set your own country foremost: work for her;
Hers to all private interests prefer.
But never dream that violence and fraud
In her name turn to praise and nobleness;
That lies are bad at home but good abroad;
That honour and fair dealing have a bound
Mark'd on the map; that any right can prove
Wrong to another, or make his right less.
And after all this, recollect—there's Love.
"Love one another!" "Yea, Lord!" look around!
After all this, there's Love—nay! Love comes first;
Else our pretended virtues are the worst
Of all the evils wherewith life is curst.

—*Fraser's Magazine.*

CORRESPONDENCE.

Letters should be brief, and written on one side of the paper only. Those intended for insertion should be addressed to the Editor, 162 St. James Street, Montreal; those on matters of business to the Manager, at the same address.

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR.

SIR,—In the last issue of your journal you commented on the sorry figure displayed at the French meeting in the lecture hall of the French Church on the evening of the day of the procession, showing the disapproval by a number of Catholic clergymen and others of the conduct of the French Government in expelling the Jesuits from that country. I recollect being in Montreal some years ago during the Franco-Prussian war; on a Sunday afternoon one of the largest processions I ever saw passed through several of the streets, headed by a large number of priests with lighted tapers, followed by men, women, little boys and little girls, with bands of music, for the success of the French nation in that contest; with all this outward display the French had to succumb before a superior force. Those who took part in that immense procession might ere this look back and see what effect it had in helping the French out of their trouble. Probably they believe that faith without works availeth nothing. Yet the out-door work on that occasion did not avail much. Still the French nation lived, and, apparently, to-day is as prosperous as ever, and I have no doubt that those who took part in that demonstration, which you refer to, will after reflection, feel that all their outward show and what they have done also, will have very little effect on the decision arrived at by the Government of France, to expel the Jesuits from that country. Notwithstanding this outward show during the day, and unnecessary inflammable speeches during the evening, the French nation will still survive, and so will French Protestants, and I have no doubt if the chairman of that meeting, Judge Loranger, were to confine his ability to his own position he would be of more service to the country than using language unbecoming his position. Whatever reason the French Government had in expelling this and other religious orders from their country, it is not a matter for us in this country to discuss. They must have some reason for it or it would not have been carried out. Why did not other cities follow the example of Montreal? there are quite as good Catholics as those in Montreal. I have no doubt they came to the sensible conclusion that they had enough to do to mind their own business and not meddle with the affairs of foreign powers. This, I hope, will satisfy those over-religious people that no outward show or demonstration can have any effect, but if it pleases those who take part in such processions, let them enjoy it; it cannot do any harm to any one else, except blockading the streets for a time. That being a Catholic country, Catholics cannot complain that they are expelled by Protestant bigotry. Hoping that this will be the last we shall hear of any foreign interference in the affairs of a foreign power,

I remain, yours,

Ottawa.

"YOU BE HANGED!"

To the Editor of the CANADIAN SPECTATOR:

The Montreal *Herald* in its issue of 9th inst., speaks of the elevation of Mr. Angers to the Bench, under the somewhat ambiguous heading, "Quem Deus vult pendere prius dementat." The use of the term, *elevation*, is, under the circumstances, very happy; we have heard of being "kicked upstairs," and of criminals being hanged with a "silken halter," &c. Every one at all conversant with the subject is aware that heraldic-Latin is often obscure and frequently Pickwickian in its application, but I protest against the writer of the paragraph in question, speaking of it as a quotation; probably his innate modesty prevented him from claiming it as a capital joke.

Yours, very respectfully,

Octopus.