

class in Canada, with their appropriate characteristics. The civil service people had become rich through the misery of their fellow-citizens. With all their riches there was little for them to enjoy in a country which ceased to afford them more—now that it had passed under the power of the English. Now, also, since they were released from employment, and on a level with the other French people, they began to feel the hatred of those other French, who rightfully regarded them as the fruitful source of misfortune and misery. Most of this class took their game with them and retired into France, where they expected to live in grand style on the proceeds of their dishonesty. But the high military chiefs also returned to France, and they were indignant at the effrontery of these men. At the demand of the military men, a Council of State was instituted under M. de Sartines, lieutenant of police, to judge sovereignly the “authors of prevarications committed in Canada.” Bigot and fifty-five others appeared before this commission. The inquiry and trial lasted two years. Bigot and his colleagues were condemned to restore 12,000,000 francs, and he and his sub-deputy, Varin, were banished from the Court.

The reason why a civil service, consisting of intendants and others, was created in France was to take away the power of the military order. The chiefs of this military order had from the earliest time become firmly established, holding great tracts of country, each one supreme within his castle, powerful, surrounded by his retainers, and independent from the rental of his own lands. Within the limit of their lands, these knights were civil magistrates as well as military commanders. Many of their ancestors had won their lands by the sword, and had been recognized as sovereigns by the Crown. But there came a time when the Crown, listening to schemes for its own aggrandizement and for the elevation of the household servants, by using greater force, took away from the feudal or military aristocracy, the civil magistracy in their own domains, and appointed thereto its own creatures.

To understand exactly who were the classes of the French in Canada and what were their condition before the war, a survey of the treaty is needed which was entered into in 1760 between Gen. Amherst, on the part of the English, and the Marquis de Vaudreil, Governor and Lieutenant-General for the King, on the part of the French.

Article 27: “The free exercise of the Roman Catholic and Apostolic religion shall remain, so that all the states and people of the towns and country-places and posts shall be able to continue to assemble in churches, and frequent the sacraments as before, without being disturbed directly or indirectly.” The English Government in this article was also petitioned to see that the people paid their tithes, as formerly, to the priests. The chapters, priests and missionaries were also to be allowed to continue their curial exercises and functions in the parishes.

Articles 34 contains the fact that there were rents of lordships (seigneuries) in the hands of priests, and it was accorded that they should still possess them, under the English, together with all their other honours, exemptions and privileges.

Article 37 concludes with the recognition that the lords of domain (seigneurs), military officers and officers of justice, and French people of town and country, and merchants, through the whole extent of Canada, should continue to possess their lordships, holdings, merchandize, with all the rights of action in regard to them that possession implies.

Article 40 includes the Indian allies of France, claiming for them the same protection as was accorded the French people, who by this treaty were placed under the government of the English. This generous proviso was well worthy the honour of the French soldiery, that they should think of their humble and defenceless allies at the time of their own misfortune. Yet it must be added that it is good fortune, not bad fortune, that causes men most frequently to forget their humble friends of yore!

As for the King of France, whose weakness and folly and patronage of unworthy favourites—that is, while they were worthy of him they were unworthy of the powers he bestowed on them—when a monument was erected to his memory in the Champs-Élysées at Paris an unknown hand traced these words on the pedestal:

Je est ici, comnee à Versailles,  
Je est sans coene at sans entrailles.

The French, it must now be seen by this sketch, entered as subjects of England in Canada, at this period, in three classes. The landed gentry (seigneurs), the priests and professional classes, and the people. They are all mentioned separately in the articles of capitulation, and their separate rights were accorded. The seigneurs had their territorial rights and courts of manor, the priests had their tithes and privileges, the merchants, farmers and manufacturers, their appropriate places according to the law of old France, under which they had lived before in Canada. It was further stipulated that thenceforward all laws made for the governance of English and French in Canada, resting on this treaty as a constitution, should be published in French as well as in English.

On this treaty the Catholic party in Canada have laid the most extravagant claims. Notwithstanding that the laws of England excluded Catholics from the throne, and that people of all classes regard the Catholic power as a menace to individual and national unity, they expected to be favoured beyond the just interpretation of the law. The treaty meant no more and no less than what its articles declare. These articles provide that the clergy shall have all the rights and privileges as they existed under the French. This did not mean that they might spread their system over Canada, create new domains and acquire greater privileges on the strength of what they already had. If the treaty is to be exactly interpreted, they were to remain as they existed at the conquest, within the same limits, with the same number of parishes, with the same number of priests. Otherwise, the seigneurs might make a claim, that inasmuch as their rights and privileges were recognized in the treaty, it implied that the feudal system ought to be extended at their demands over the whole of Canada also.

VISCOUNT DE FRONSAC.

\* \* \*

### Margaret in the Valley.

Amidst these grandeurs of the hills,  
My love came long ago to me,  
And him alone they show to me,  
His spirit the horizon fills.

Dark verdure of the solemn pines,  
How stern and grave your mystery!  
You chant my heart's sad history  
In mournful, immemorial lines.

Ye glades that skirt the rocky verge—  
That shuts this quiet landscape in  
Far from the city's dust and din—  
Ye listen silent to the dirge

But twice a day your peace is vain:  
Broken by steam's o'er-mastering throb:  
I hear the imprisoned giant sob,  
The long procession of the train.

And once I yearned to hear the roar  
That broke the stillness of the lea;  
But since it bore my love from me,  
I hate its tumult more and more!

BERNARD McEVROY.

\* \* \*

### The New Spirit.

TO lament the love of the novel is the extreme of unreason; for, in a way, it is by the novel that we advance. Experiment is but dissatisfaction with the known, and it is by experiment that progress is made. Had Copernicus rested in Ptolemy, we might still have believed that the sun moved round the earth. But—owing, perhaps, to the power of experiment (at all events in science—and this, we have often enough been told, is a “scientific age”), we are a little apt to attribute to the novel an efficacy it does not wholly possess. We rail at the Church for its treatment of Galileo; but if all were Galileos and there were no Church, there might be trouble. There are down-hills in the path-way of progress: and the coach that has no skid comes to grief. Pope's dictum, “Whatever is, is right,” to-day we amend by reading “Whatever is, is rectifiable.” So it may be. But not at once. This, it seems to me, is the lesson that