

CANADIAN SONG.

(AIR: "THE SHAMROCK.")

I.
Come, fill a glass,
And let it pass,
We'll drink to one another;
Each soul we meet
We'll kindly greet,
As our Canadian brother;
We are all one,
The day is gone
When discord swept around us—
A holy band
Upon our land,
Fast each to each has bound us.

CHORUS.

Oh, our fair land!
Our dear Canadian rare land!
No foreign host shall ever boast,
Our dear Canadian rare land!

II.

Both Scott and Frank
In equal rank,
With Saxon, Celt and stranger,
United stand
A nation grand,
When looms the coming danger:
In love and peace,
Our hopes increase—
Our bonds grow fast and faster,
E'en to our name,
Our lot's the same—
Nor have we slave or master.

III.

Then let us prize
Canadian skies,
Canadian hills and mountains,
Canadian lakes,
Canadian brakes,
Canadian rivers and fountains,
From East to West,
Be ever blest
Our land so young in story,
May a maple shine,
And round her twine
Their wreaths of brightest glory!

JOSEPH K. FORAN.

Green Park, Aylmer, Aug. 22, 1879.

WHO GOES FIRST?

ETIQUETTE OF PRECEDENCE IN ENGLISH SOCIETY.

We must begin, like Euclid, with axioms to be taken for granted. First, that there are five "grades" in the peerage, in this order: dukes, marquises, earls, viscounts and barons, dukes being highest and barons lowest; and, secondly, that any peer's eldest son is lower in rank than his father and higher than his brothers (who are equals).

If this be understood and granted it will be seen that there are fifteen different degrees or steps of rank for gentlemen who are peers or sons of peers. And the rule which establishes the relative ranks of all these is this:

"The eldest son of a peer of any grade ranks next below a peer of the next grade below and next above a younger son of a peer of the next grade above."

For mathematicians we may state the "formula" thus:

"The eldest son of a peer of the n th grade ranks next below a peer of the $n+1$ th grade, and next above a younger son of a peer of the $n-1$ th grade," a duke being considered as of the first grade.

Now let us apply this rule in the different instances. First, take the case of a marquis' eldest son. The rule becomes:

"The eldest son of a marquis ranks next below an earl and next above a duke's younger son."

Next, taking the case of an earl's eldest son: "An earl's eldest son ranks next below a viscount and next above a marquis' younger son."

Similarly, "a viscount's eldest son ranks next below a baron, and next above an earl's younger son."

In the case of the eldest son of a duke or baron only one-half of the rule will apply; thus, "a duke's eldest son ranks next below a marquis," and "a baron's eldest son ranks next above a viscount's younger son."

The five examples given above include all the fifteen steps, except the highest and the lowest. Adding these in their proper places, we may form a complete Table of Precedence, which will be as follows (bracketing those steps which appeared in the same example):

1. Dukes.
2. Marquises.
3. Dukes' eldest sons.
4. Earls.
5. Marquises' eldest sons.
6. Duke's younger sons.
7. Viscounts.
8. Earls' eldest sons.
9. Marquises' younger sons.
10. Barons.
11. Viscounts' eldest sons.
12. Earls' younger sons.
13. Baron's eldest sons.
14. Viscounts' younger sons.
15. Barons' younger sons.

A duke, as is generally known, is styled "His Grace." The next nine steps, from marquises to barons, both inclusive, are "Lords;" a marquis being "Most Hon." and the other eight "Right Hon." The five lowest steps are simply "Hon." In the case of younger sons of dukes and Marquises the title "Lord" is placed before the

Christian name, which must be expressed either in full or at least by one initial. For instance, it is quite incorrect to write or speak of Lord George Hamilton as "Lord Hamilton." Newspapers often commit the error. "Lord G. Hamilton" may be written, or "Lord George" either written or spoken; but "Lord Hamilton" could only mean a peer or a peer's eldest son.

In one respect, the precedence of ladies is more simple than that of gentlemen: there is no principle of promogeniture among daughters. If an earl, for instance, has eight daughters, they all take rank as *eldest* daughters, and for purposes of precedence there is no such thing as a "younger daughter." This accounts for that which at first sight seems an anomaly, viz.: that all an earl's daughters are "ladies," whereas only one son is a "lord." The advantage which ladies enjoy in this respect forms some compensation for the more frequent honours which are naturally enough bestowed upon their husbands or brothers; of which honours some are not capable of being shared by a wife, and others shine in solitary grandeur where there is no wife or sister to share them.

Hence, if a Table of Precedence were to contain only peeresses and their daughters, we should have no more than ten different steps. But with these ten steps we have to combine ten more, representing the wives of eldest sons and the wives of younger sons. Strictly speaking, an eldest son's wife is equal in rank to her sister-in-law, but the latter, by a graceful "courtesy," yields precedence to her; and thus, as we said above, the number of steps is practically twenty, though theoretically fifteen.

Remembering, then, that a wife shares her husband's rank in the peerage—except in certain cases, which we shall consider presently—the following Table of Precedence will follow naturally from what has been said. The "degrees" are added, 20, as before, representing a baron or baroness.

Duchesses	32
Marchionesses	29
Wives of dukes' eldest sons	28
Dukes' daughters	27
Countesses	26
Wives of marquises' eldest sons	25
Marquises' daughters	24
Wives of dukes' younger sons	23
Viscountesses	22
Wives of earls' eldest sons	21
Earls' daughters	20
Wives of marquises' younger sons	19
Baronesses	18
Wives of viscounts' eldest sons	17
Viscounts' daughters	16
Wives of earls' younger sons	15
Wives of barons' eldest sons	14
Barons' daughters	13
Wives of viscounts' younger sons	12
Wives of barons' younger sons	11

In this table those ladies who derive their rank from their husbands are supposed to be of lower rank by birth, or at any rate, of equal rank; for, if this is not the case, ladies retain their unmarried rank, unless they marry peers. For instance, suppose the Lady Mary Smith, an earl's daughter, marries the Lord John Jones, a duke's younger son. The bridegroom is of higher rank than the bride, who, therefore, becomes the Lady John Jones, taking his rank; but if she rejects Lord John and marries Lord George Brown instead, whose father is only a Marquis, then she will be of the higher rank, and will retain her maiden designation, Lady Mary, becoming Lady Mary Brown, just as if her husband were an honorable, or a baronet, or a commoner of any kind. If, however, our supposed Lady Mary Smith, instead of giving her hand to either of the younger sons mentioned above, aspire to a coronet and marry a baron, she will actually lose rank in one sense, for she will rank as a baroness, who is lower than an earl's daughter. This loss of conventional rank is supposed to be fully compensated by the superior dignity "which doth hedge" an actual peeress. A similar anomaly exists in the case of an English bishopric being accepted by a clergyman who is by birth of higher rank than a bishop. For, unless he is a viscount, or a temporal peer of some higher grade still, he takes rank, on entering the House of Lords, as a bishop, that is, as a senior baron. Hence, Lord Arthur Hervey, the son of a marquis, lost rank, technically speaking, upon taking his seat as Bishop of Bath and Wells; since a marquis' younger son is higher than a bishop. And, anomalous as it may seem, his wife is now of higher rank than himself, though deriving her rank from him; for his lordship ranks as a bishop, or senior baron, while her ladyship ranks as the wife of a marquis' younger son, a bishop's rank not being communicable to his wife.

Another anomaly may be noticed here, viz.: the case of a "lady" who marries a "lord" of lower rank than herself, when he is an "eldest son" bearing, by courtesy, his father's "second title." In this case the lady would gain no compensation as a peeress by sharing her husband's rank, and, therefore, in accordance with the usual principle that ladies are allowed to retain after marriage any higher rank which they have previously enjoyed, she is known by her husband's courtesy title, exactly as if it were a surname, her own Christian name being placed before it. Thus Viscount Sandon, an earl's eldest son, married a marquis' daughter, who is not styled "Viscountess Sandon," but "the Lady Mary Sandon." If the married pair are of equal rank, it is usual for the lady to share her husband's rank, instead of insisting upon displaying her own. Thus Lord Elcho, a Scotch earl's eldest son, married an English earl's daughter, who is styled Lady Elcho.

With regard, however, to ladies, in cases of ambiguity it is usually conceded to them by

society to choose for themselves. A widow is thus allowed by general custom to retain, if she pleases, the rank and title which she derived from her first husband after a second marriage by which, in theory, she unquestionably loses both. The celebrated Dr. Whewell, the Master of Trinity, married Lady Affleck, a Baronet's widow, and she, it is said, wished thenceforth to be known as Mrs. Whewell, her second husband being, indeed, an infinitely better known man than her first. But the master, with a curious kind of weakness, preferred the sound of "Lady Affleck," and consequently to her dying day the great philosopher's wife never bore his name, but only that of his obscure predecessor!

An instance of the opposite, and far more becoming, usage is afforded by the case of the present Countess of Derby, who, having been previously married to a Marquis, might have retained her former rank, but prefers to share the rank and title of her second husband.

But we are digressing from the subject of precedence. And we have said nothing of the various knights and of their wives. As was said before, the wives of baronets and knights are more properly styled dames. "Lady" and "ladyship" are usurpations on their part, and give rise to the apparent anomaly than an "Hon. Mrs." is higher than many a "lady." We do not know how that accomplished lady who is best known as "the Hon. Mrs. Norton" chose to be styled during the few last months of her life after she had married Sir W. Stirling-Maxwell. "Mrs. Norton" would really have been the higher title, but "Lady Maxwell" would have sounded so. We have heard of a fictitious character who in the same circumstances elected to "eat her cake and have it" by claiming the best of both titles, as though the celebrated daughter of Tom Sheridan had dubbed herself "the Hon. Lady Maxwell."

But there are dames and dames. Sir Robert Walpole was a Knight of the Garter while yet a Commoner; and, though at present the distinguished nonagenarian, Viscount Stratford de Redclyffe, is the only Knight of the Garter of any rank beneath an Earldom, there is no reason why Mr. Gladstone, e. g., when his party return to power, should not be decorated with any garter that may be vacant. If so, he would rank just below the eldest sons of barons, and, therefore, above the younger sons of viscounts and many other "honourables." But the lowest "honorable" is higher than the highest (or "premier") baronet, and baronets are higher than all the orders of knighthood other than the Garter. Hence, between the dame whose husband was a Knight of the Garter and whose husband had been "knighted" for presenting an address, there would be an almost immeasurable difference of rank.

We alluded above to certain "prefixes" which some dignitaries in the Church enjoy. We cannot but think, however, that it would be a much more edifying state of things if the Church would discard such apparent claims on the part of some to be greater than others. The system of entitling the clergy "Reverend" has a smack of worldliness and vanity which ought to be most foreign to their sacred office. Many of them object to it, and drop the "Rev." for instance, on the title-pages of books written by them. And since it has been ruled by a court of law that "Reverend" is no legal title, but merely a designation of respect, there is nothing to prevent any demagogue who preaches on a tub from assuming it. The vicar of a remote country parish had a worthy parishioner, a cobbler, whose sons were "preachers." The vicar met the cobbler's wife one day with a letter in her hand, waiting to give it to the rural postman. They had a little conversation. "I've been writing to my son, sir," said Mrs. B., holding up the letter that the parson might see the address. It began "The Rev." The good woman (who is said to have been a preacher herself in former days) doubtless thought her son was "as good as the parson," and took care to let the latter know it.

We can fancy that many of the bishops must often be inwardly wearied by the "right reverend" and "lordship" which accompany their episcopal functions, and that they would willingly forgive the ignorance of those who have not studied the rules of rank, precedence, etc. The head master of a cathedral school received not long ago a letter from a bishop, inclosing an application, envelope and all, which the secretary of the athletic sports committee in the school had sent to his lordship for a subscription toward prizes, etc. The good-natured prelate inclosed a check for a guinea. The head master guessed the reason why the secretary's envelope was sent. It had been addressed to "The Very Rev. the Lord Bishop of —," instead of "The Right Rev." In order to prevent such carelessness in future the master, who enjoyed the joke, propounded to Mr. Secretary and his fellow committee boys some such heraldic problems as the following, to be solved as part of their evening work:

What is the right way to begin and to address a letter to: (a) A marquis who is a general? (b) a viscount who is a dean? (c) an admiral who is a duke's younger son? (d) a bishop who is an earl's younger son? (e) a baron who is an archdeacon? (f) a baronet who is a major, etc.

There were, of course, some absurd mistakes made in the answers, such as "Viscount the Very Rev. the Dean of X," "The Ven. Lord Archdeacon Y," "My Lord General," etc. But the boys probably made no mistakes of this kind the next time they sent out "begging" circulars.

WHAT TO DRINK.

In these sweltering summer days, when a man feels very much like taking off his flesh and sitting in his bones, as witty Sydney Smith once advised, one is apt to look about him for a good temperance drink with which to slake his thirst. Good temperance drinks, however, are not easily found, and the man of temperate habits must, in nine cases out of ten, content himself with some of the sloppy beverages, or wear a parched throat for the remainder of the day. Up to the present time lager beer afforded a somewhat grateful appeaser of thirst, and temperance men hailed it as a boon, but an over-shrewd chemist in St. John, N.B., lately analysed a quantity of a certain German fluid, and discovered that it was an intoxicant and contained a considerable proportion of alcohol in its composition. Of course, after such an opinion, no temperance man can drink the creamy lager, but must solace himself with the innumerable varieties of ginger beer, spruce beer, Ottawa pop, and other soft drinks. These, however, are far from satisfying, and the palate soon grows weary of soda plain, or soda with syrup, or that other mysterious compound, yelet Sarsaparilla Mead, which foams but does not inebriate. The question is a momentous one; this question of drinks for the man who has "sworn off," and who seeks something mild as a substitute for the whiskeys, and brandies and wines of other days. Dr. Richardson, a London physician of much note, the inventor of anesthetic appliances, and one of the first men in his profession, has been giving this subject of cheap and simple summer beverages a good deal of his attention. The learned doctor is a prominent temperance man, and the President of the British Medical Temperance Association—an organization which has done in its time a vast amount of good in the community. A banquet of the society was held in London recently, and the banquettes had a fine opportunity of practically testing a few of the refreshing mixtures which Dr. Richardson laid before them as harmless, non-intoxicants. These combined several varieties of unfermented wines, including favorite brands of "Port" and "Sherry," fruit drinks, malt drinks containing no alcohol, hop beverages—a species doubtless of soft cider—very pleasant to the taste, made, as may be supposed, from apples, an inspissated juice of the grape, acid in tone and tonic in character, and some others. Ginger ale was awarded an honored place in the collection, and pronounced by the connoisseurs of the party to be the finest drink of the lot. Admirable fruit essences, and attractive "liquors," unfermented, concluded a list which furnished variety enough for all purposes and requirements. But one very agreeable drink, healthy, vital, uninebriating, and a sure quencher of thirst, appears to have been omitted from the "card." There seems to have been no Montserrat Lime Juice at the festive board, and that was assuredly a very serious omission. It is a well authenticated fact that no finer temperance drink exists than good lime juice, sweetened with loaf sugar and freely diluted with water. It is just the "neat thing" these hot, roasting days, when soda water with its sticky syrups only increases the thirst, when lager beer and Dr. Richardson's unfermented wines are not available here in Canada. Lime Juice is healthy, it is highly beneficial at sea, and on land it acts as a good medicine for the cure of rheumatism and all bilious complaints. It is palatable, refreshing and cheering. It is *par excellence* the temperance drink, and those who take something, whether Sons of the Order or not, should encourage a beverage which possesses every virtue, and has not a single vice.

G. S.

Quebec.

Duty and privilege are usually a unit. Like cause and effect, they are so related that you cannot separate them without destroying both. Like soul and body, they are identical in the living man. Take away the duty of keeping, and the privilege of sharing is gone; take away the privilege, and the duty is so disabled as to have no motive power. In nature, in morals and law, in right, advantage, and blessing, they are one.

A BLUE BLOSSOM.

A small blue flower with yellow eye
Hath mightier spell to move my soul
Than even the mightiest notes which roll
From man's most perfect minstrelsy:
A flash, a momentary gleam,
A glimpse of some celestial dream—
And tears alone are left to me.

Filled with a longing vague and dim,
I hold the flower in every light;
To purge my soul's re-darkened sight
I grope till all my senses swim;
In vain! I feel the ecstasy
Only when suddenly I see
This pale star with the sapphire rim.

Nor hath this blossom such strange power,
Because it saith "Forget me not,"
For some heart-holden distant spot,
Or silent tongue, or buried hour;
I think immortal memories
Of some past scenes of Paradise
Speak to my spirit thro' the flower.

Forgotten is our ancient tongue—
Too dull our ears, our eyes too blind,
Even quite to catch its tones, or find
Its symbols written bright among
All shapes of beauty; but 'tis hard,
When one can hear, to be debarred
From knowledge of the meaning sung.

CHARLES G. D. ROBERTA.

Fredericton, N.B.