

present rally. There has perhaps been hardly another instance, except the case of Garfield, of a man's death agonies being thus minutely reported and watched in their daily progress by a curious and sympathizing world. If the General reads the papers they must be pleasant reading for him. He may learn from them that his case, struggle as he may, is hopeless; that of operations for the excision of cancer only 14 per cent. have been successful; that in his case owing to the situation of the cancer an operation is out of the question; that his torture may possibly be prolonged for two years from the first appearance of the disease; but that death may ensue at any time either from exhaustion caused by putrid pneumonia, from an enlargement of the cancer so as to prevent food from entering the stomach, thus killing him from starvation, or from an ulceration of an artery and hemorrhage. The advocates of "Euthanasia" will point to this touching case and ask why a man, when medical science has irrevocably pronounced his doom, should not be allowed to die an easy death instead of being condemned thus to expire in tortures worse and more protracted than the cruel ingenuity of Italian tyrants ever devised for its victims. The physician, of course, is bound by the existing rules of morality and of his profession to play to the very end the game of chess against death, even though everything worthy of the name of life may have gone, and nothing but the capacity for exquisite suffering may remain. Nor can it be denied that there would be great difficulty in authorizing him, as the Euthanasians propose, even with the deliberate consent of the patient, to terminate the scene of agony. Yet the question will probably some day present itself for serious consideration. The theological argument that Providence has sent the suffering is, like many other arguments from what are assumed to be ordinances of Providence, of little real validity. If Providence has sent the suffering, Providence has also sent the means of escape.

In English law there is no wrong without a remedy. By availing himself of a special formula a subject can always bring suit against the Crown. But in the law of the United States there may be a wrong and a great wrong without a remedy. This appeared in the great Virginia case, on which judgment was delivered the other day by the Supreme Court. An invaluable article of the Constitution forbids any legislation which would impair the obligation of contracts; but there is a much less admirable amendment of the Constitution declaring that no State shall be liable to be sued. There is reason for suspecting that this amendment was obtained for the very purpose of enabling States to repudiate. Virginia, seduced from the path of honour by the pestilent and knavish demagogue, Malone, has repudiated, and has forbidden her collectors to receive for taxes the coupons of State bonds, notwithstanding a promise on the face of the bonds that the coupons will be so received. Suit was brought against the collectors who had distrained upon taxpayers notwithstanding the tender of the coupons. Virginia pleaded her sovereign right under the constitutional amendment to swindle with impunity. But the suit being against the collectors, not against the State, the Supreme Court happily found itself able, though by a divided judgment, to protect the holders of the coupons. To the extent therefore of the value which the coupons may have as legal tender for taxes, justice is done to the creditors of the State. Perhaps further justice may be done hereafter when the devil of repudiation shall have been cast out and Virginia, coming to her right mind, shall see how much more valuable her credit is than her stealings. Sydney Smith, the satiric flagellator of Pennsylvanian repudiation, sold out at 30; but the Pennsylvanian bonds were afterwards at 120. Mississippi, it is true, did not do so well, but Mississippi was a slave State; and in slave States there was abundance of chivalry but very little honour.

#### M. LETELLIER DE SAINT-JUST\*

If M. Letellier de Saint-Just had not become conspicuous for the courage which led him, in the exercise of the prerogative, as Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, to dismiss his ministers, and thereby bring on himself the revenge of his own dismissal, he would not have been unknown to fame for the life-battle which he waged against the Roman Catholic priests of his Province, and which was provoked by their encroachments on the political domain. The contention that in dismissing the De Boucherville Ministry he went beyond the limits of his constitutional powers has not been successfully maintained. To dismiss him on the pretence that "his usefulness was gone" was to avoid a decision on the merits of the case. M. Casgrain assures us that the decision on which he acted was arrived at

by the Lieutenant-Governor without prompting or suggestion from any human being: a statement which is no doubt intended to silence the gossips who pretended to be able to name the adviser and to state the hour and the day on which he started on his pilgrimage to drop poison into the ear of the occupant of Spencer Wood. No farther additional light is thrown upon the incidents which put M. Letellier's name into every mouth, and which probably shortened his mortal as well as his official career. But a flood of light is thrown upon his struggles with the clergy and the spirit of the opposition which, in electoral contests, he had to meet.

How the Liberal Party of Lower Canada, with Lafontaine at its head, began to be Conservative, and how the tendency once commenced acquired additional force, M. P. B. Casgrain, in his account of the life and times of M. Letellier de Saint-Just very plainly shows. In Lower Canada the "Pléiade Rouge" which appeared above the horizon gradually developed into the Rouge Party. *Les Enfants Terribles of l'Avenir* were its prophets; its tendencies were republican, and it began its career by a vigorous onslaught upon tithes and the influence of the priests, whom it alienated and provoked into resistance. In Upper Canada Mr. Brown had put himself at the head of the Grit Party, to which he had at first been opposed. The programme of this party M. Cassault describes as being "about the same as that of the Rouges." The *Globe*, taking up the note sounded by Lord John Russell when Wiseman was made Archbishop of Westminster, observed no measure in its denunciation of the Roman Catholics. By a natural law of antagonism M. Cauchon brought the *Journal de Québec*, of which he was editor, and which was then the most powerful of all the French journals of Lower Canada, to the support of the assailed priests. These events gave to the political contests a degree of bitterness before unknown. The secession of the Rouges of Lower Canada and of the Grits in Upper Canada weakened the Liberal Party. The seceders, while ostensibly contemning the principles of the Tories, fought side by side with them; the contact created no repugnance, even at the first; uniformity of aim—the defeat of the Government—made the heterogeneous allies brothers in arms, if not in heart; and after the alliance had been endured for a while the fortuitous concurrence ended in a fraternal embrace in the presence of the public to which it afforded the sensation of a genuine scandal. The embrace had taken place at the polls; and after the elections were over, the Tories, who had never had any real relish for the alliance, finding themselves too feeble with the aid of these new and strange bed-fellows to grasp the reins of power, deserted their accidental allies and threw in their lot with the Liberals. From the moment the coalition was formed the Liberals became more and more Conservative, and the allied forces gave themselves the self-contradictory name of "Liberal-Conservatives."

The intermixture of politics and religion continued to embitter party contests; and it fell out that almost the entire political life of M. Letellier de Saint-Just was a battle with the clergy of his own Church. Yet he was himself a "good Catholic," and he seems to have suffered vicariously for the sins of others whose doctrines he never formally embraced. At his first election to the Legislative Assembly he consented to accept the position of a delegate pledged to uphold a programme which his supporters put into his hands, and which contained, among other things, a declaration in favour of Protection. But these "imperative instructions" he is said to have had a large share in framing. His opponent, M. Chapais, sought, by insinuation rather than by direct averment, to make him responsible for the opinions of *l'Avenir*; but he had not come into direct collision with the priests, and in the absence of their active interference he was elected. The first vote he gave was against the Lafontaine-Baldwin Government, though his course during the first session was remarkable for the independent part he played. For these two leaders, both of whom retired this session (1851), he had a genuine admiration. Of M. Papineau his opinion was not so exalted. Of Sir John Macdonald he wrote, at this early date: "This man is destined, if God spares his life, to out-distance all competitors in the race."

In M. Letellier's second election contest for Kamouraska, his opponent, M. Chapais, fought him with ammunition furnished by the *Globe*, in the shape of attacks upon the Roman Catholics. "He was sure to produce the effect desired," says M. Casgrain, "by tracing the connection between the Rouges and the Clear Grits." The clergy took sides against M. Letellier; and he gave mortal offence to one of them by telling him that his proper place was not the political platform from which he found him delivering a direct attack against himself. From this time the immense influence of the clergy made itself felt in the political contests of Lower Canada. *l'Avenir* claimed M. Letellier as a Rouge, and he did not repudiate the claim; in this his biographer thinks he was wrong, and contends that he ought to have appropriated the name of "Democrat," as

\* Etude Historique; Letellier de Saint-Just et son Temps.