

are invited by their priests to meet on that day in the Cathedral and march to the Jesuit Church in token of protest against the French Government for the expulsion of the Jesuits from France. But I hope and believe that the procession will be but a poor affair; for surely the French in Montreal have a regard for their mother country. The Jesuits, about to be expelled, are not at heart French; they are not concerned about the peace and prosperity of France, but for the honour and glory of the Church. They are the enemies of popular liberties, of progress in education and self-government and wealth; they are opposed to all knowledge which does not filter through their ecclesiasticism. The French Government has found it impossible to get along with them in the country distorting public opinion and disturbing the peace. Expulsion is not, perhaps, what liberty-loving Englishmen would advocate, but why the French in Montreal should declare against the Government of France, and for the Jesuits, I cannot see. Never a people yet owed thanks to the disciples of Ignatius Loyola.

The enforcement of the anti-Jesuit decrees in France is causing trouble, several officials at Versailles having resigned. Some years since, a decree was passed forbidding religious processions and now the anti-Jesuit decree is another stop toward proper government and will remove a disturbing element from the country. France has been held to be a Roman Catholic country—if this is true, what is Canada? Such decrees could not by any possibility be enforced here.

Even considering the matter from an ecclesiastical point of view, there is not much in the expulsion of the Jesuits for the general Catholic Church to weep over. The Jesuits have always been a sect, working with no other sect, always intriguing for power, and always a trouble. Clement XIV., one of the wisest and best, although one of the most calumniated of all the Popes, yielding to his own judgment, and the general opinion of Europe, suppressed the entire order in 1773. Clement excused his rough and salutary action on the ground that the Jesuits were precipitating a conflict between the civil powers and the Church—that they were greedy of power and generally a nuisance. The only pity is that Clement's idea did not predominate in the minds of all his successors in office, so that Jesuitry could have been kept in a perpetual state of suppression.

The number of French-Canadians who have arrived at Quebec during the week must be large, and the Ancient Capital will have found its narrow streets filled to overflowing. Why the St. Jean Baptiste celebration should have been held there is hard to discover—the streets are narrow, hotel accommodation very inadequate and uncomfortable—the only redeeming feature being that the scenery is truly grand. The French-Canadians while passing through Montreal showed an anxiety to conceal their nationality, evidently wishing to pass for Americans; this was sufficiently ludicrous when they had come in to take part in their national celebration. The Bonaventure Depot was crowded with a mass of moving dusters, which were the only things that would have induced one to think that these ambitious Canadians were Americans.

Mr. Masson has been compelled to withdraw from the Dominion Cabinet on account of ill health, and carries with him into retirement the sincere respect of all Canadians. He has a record which bears witness to more than ordinary ability, and unblemished probity of character. He has been a party man of course, but liberal in his ideas, true in his instincts and honest in purpose and in conduct. May Sir John A. Macdonald find as good a man to take his place.

Did Hanlan get a stitch in the side at the Providence Regatta? Probably he did, and probably it was providential. His successes had got to be monotonous; very soon he would have to submit to being handicapped or scratched, or something of the sort. But now he has made it plain that no mortal is beyond the reach of accident, or should discard a "plaster" unadvisedly; only—accidents, plasters, weeping till the eyes got red, despondency, and the doctors's report notwithstanding—very many people persist in believing that Hanlan's loss of the race was another proof that manliness in athletics has given place to lucre.

Very many of my friends have been somewhat perplexed by the remarks I made last week as to the basis of union in our churches. Let me say that I thought they would be perfectly well understood as only referring to a portion of our church going people. It is only too true that the Christian ministry of to-day is in the main a profession.

I stated last week that the Grand Trunk Railway had obtained a charter to build a railway from Huntingdon and Dundee *via* Laprairie to Montreal. This is not strictly correct. It was the Montreal and Champlain Junction Railway which got the charter, but as the business will come into Montreal over the Victoria Bridge, the Grand Trunk is the municipal factor in the matter.

A judgment of the highest importance has just been rendered by the Court of Appeals, in Montreal, in the case of Dobie against the Temporalities Board. The story eventuating in the present issue is briefly told. Imperial legislation—the Constitutional Act of 1791—provided that a "Protestant clergy" should receive certain portions of the public lands for its support. The Church of England claimed a monopoly of the bounty of the Crown, but subsequently, after long struggles—legal, ecclesiastical, and legislative—the rights of the Church of Scotland were recognized, and from the proceeds of the sale of the "Clergy Reserve" lands about £130,000 were conceded to the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland. This was in 1855, and the then ministers of the latter church renounced their personal claims on this sum, and agreed that it should be funded and maintained in Trust as a permanent endowment of the church. This arrangement was made on the express condition that each minister should receive a stipulated annual allowance from the fund, and that in the event of any minister discontinuing his connection with the Presbyterian Church of Canada in connection with the Church of Scotland, he should lose all right to participate in the benefits derivable from it. An Act of Parliament (22 Vic., cap. 66) was obtained from the Parliament of the old Province of Canada, which provided for the permanent administration of the Fund for the above purposes.

Everything went smoothly enough until 1875, when a majority of the ministers of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in connection with the Church of Scotland, united their fortunes with the old "Free Church" and two other Presbyterian denominations, under the name of the "Presbyterian Church in Canada." The minority, however, continued the old Church, and claimed the right to administer the fund for the benefit of those who maintained the old connection. This demand was refused by the new Church. The Rev. Mr. Dobie, a minister of Milton, Ontario, was thereupon selected as the standard-bearer of the old connection, and in his name suits were instituted to test the legality of two Acts of the Quebec Legislature which authorised the union of the four Churches referred to, and made certain amendments to the original Act of the old Province of Canada incorporating the Board. The Board relied on these Acts of the Legislature, and over these a series of legal duels have been fought.

Judge Jetté decided in the Superior Court that the Quebec Acts, amending the Canada Act, were legal and constitutional, and dismissed Mr. Dobie's action. Nothing daunted, he gave security, and appealed to the highest Court of the Province, by which a judgment has just been rendered confirming the first judgment—not, however, without a powerful dissent. Of the five Judges who sat in the Court of Appeals—two, the Chief-Justice and Judge Monk, thought the Quebec Acts constitutional, whereas Judges Ramsay, Tessier and McCord decided that the Acts were unconstitutional. Strange to say though Mr. Dobie's main pretension that the Acts are unconstitutional was supported by a majority of the Court, the fortunes of law were against him. Judge McCord, though with the appellant as to the unconstitutionality of the Act, decided against him, on the ground of want of "interest" in the case. This only shows how a man may in law sometimes lose, even when he has the cards in his hand!

And why are the Acts constitutional or unconstitutional? The Local Legislature has, by the Confederation Act, control over "property and Civil Rights in the Province." Upon these words and the neighbouring provisions of the Confederation Act the issue hangs.