

Ross, J. H. Cameron, Col. Prince, and others scarcely less distinguished. Col. Prince was constantly stirring up the bitter element. At one time he would sneer, and bitterly accuse certain members of secretly participating in the Rebellion. Mr. W. Lyon Mackenzie once said, pointing to the doughty Colonel: "He is the man who, when letting some prisoners free, ordered the troops to fire on them as they were fleeing for their lives. He," continued the little man—for he was small compared to the so-called "English gentleman"—"ordered them to be shot in cold blood." "And," exclaimed the Colonel "they were shot accordingly. I am only sorry that you were not of the number." Assailing Mr. Lafontaine one evening, he began: "There was one Hypolite Lafontaine." Hesitating for a moment, he began again with "Mr. Speaker, I see the honourable member has gone to sleep, and as I make it a point never to attack a man behind his back I will wait for him;" and then proceeded to others to whom he paid his compliments. But Mr. Lafontaine did not escape, for he soon awoke, and was dressed down accordingly. Col. Prince once described Mr. J. Hillyard Cameron as "the member with the flute-like voice," and all who remember Mr. Cameron will admit the aptness of the illustration. Col. Prince prided himself upon the title of a "British Whig," and generally spoke of this country as "this Canada of ours." After sitting in the Assembly many years for Essex, he entered the Legislative Council, and subsequently was appointed Judge of Algoma. He cared little for Canadian politics, yet was invariably found voting on the Conservative side.

Mr. Dominic Daly was familiarly known as "The Lily of the Valley," or "Perpetual Secretary," from the fact that no matter what party was in power he was found in the same position as a member of the administration for a long series of years. He only relinquished his hold when appointed Governor of New South Wales. Mr. Gowan was the most prominent Orangeman in Canada. By no means a pleasing speaker, he, nevertheless, held high rank as a Parliamentary debater, and was a sharp thorn in the side of any ministry he opposed. Mr. Hume Blake was the best orator. As a pleader at the Bar he had no superior, and finally became Chancellor of the Court of Chancery which he had assisted to change in spite of the remonstrances of Mr. Baldwin. Mr. John Hillyard Cameron was another brilliant luminary, and on being appointed Solicitor-General was given a seat in the Cabinet, a position never before accorded to the second law officer of the Crown.

Lord Elgin was sent out as Governor-General in January, 1847, and found a tottering ministry in power. Gradually growing weaker, it, however, held out through another session, after sustaining defeat on some unimportant measures, and at last decided to dissolve Parliament. Mr. Draper, having retired to the Bench, left a small band of determined Conservatives to fight as best they could a new Ministry formed under the joint leadership of Messrs. Baldwin and Lafontaine who were again back in their accustomed places. As an indication of the feeling in Lower Canada, Dr. Nelson and Louis Papineau, who, along with Dr. Rolph and others, had returned from exile, were elected to the new Parliament. It was against the most formidable Ministerial body the country had ever known that a mere handful of Conservatives—some twenty-five all told—with Sir Allan MacNab at their head, had to contend. The session, which opened a month after the election, would have been a stormy one; but fortunately it only lasted a few weeks.

The next Parliament, and the last held in Montreal, opened in January, 1849. The Speech from the Throne made reference to general matters only, and the omission of a measure to revive the Rebellion Losses Bill led to the belief that the subject would not come up. That notion was dispelled, however, when Mr. Lafontaine introduced resolutions affirming the payment of the losses in accordance with the proposition previously made. The Opposition contended that persons implicated in the insurrection would receive payment for losses caused by themselves. The Government declared there was no intention of paying those who had actually taken up arms on the side of the insurgents; while the Conservatives pointed to the list which they said contained the name of Dr. Nelson who, though not caught with arms in his hands, participated in the rebellion against the Crown. Great excitement arose in all quarters, causing meetings to be held to protest against the Bill. The old spirit of antagonism was aroused, but this time the Reformers of both sections were in unison. Matters grew worse, but the Opposition indulged the hope that the measure they so strongly resisted would, on account of its peculiar character, be reserved for her Majesty to deal with; and that belief was strengthened by the implied assurance that the Bill was not of the number which it was announced the Governor-General would shortly sanction. When His Excellency appeared upon the scene on the memorable 26th of April 1849, to give his assent to Bills passed, the one for the payment of the Rebellion Losses was one of those he sanctioned. No sooner had the assent been given than the tidings spread through the streets like wild-fire, and soon a howling mob was seen in pursuit of the retreating Governor-General whose carriage was rapidly driven to the Vice-Regal residence, which he reached after being subjected to the most disgraceful insults that could have been offered. Meanwhile excited persons were addressing a large crowd on the Champ de Mars, and the cry being raised "to the Parliament Houses," a rush was made; and the mob on reaching the spot began pelting stones through the windows, and at length entered the building, the members having made a speedy exit on the approach of the mob. Opinions differ as to the manner in

which the destruction of the Parliament Buildings was brought about. It was said that a torch did the work, but that is considered doubtful; notwithstanding the buildings were burned. Col. Chisholm, now no more, was Sergeant-at-Arms, and held his ground until it was no longer tenable. His account of the affair I had from his own lips. He said that the mob on entering threw him aside and at once began to demolish everything within reach. The desks, chairs, books and papers were thrown about in a promiscuous mass; and then followed the smashing of chandeliers and very soon the loose papers and other combustible material around caught fire from the broken lamps. He waited until the flames burst out when a rush back was made, and the mob left the structure to destruction. Be it as it may, there can be no excuse or palliation for such an atrocious act; nor can the destruction of the Parliament Houses be considered accidental, inasmuch as those who caused it went thither bent upon destroying them in some form or other. The deed left a dark stain upon the chief city of Canada—a stain that can never be wiped out.

OCTOGENARIAN.

JUNE.

Oh golden June; in close embrace
The sunshine holds thee, and thy face
Is kissed by gentlest winds that press
With lingering lips thy loveliness.

The sweet wild rose and violet,
Red clover bloom and mignonette,
Make for thy brows a fragrant crown;
Of brightest emerald is thy gown.

The silver streamlets are thy gems—
Rarer than princes' diadems.
And everywhere thy footsteps pass
The gleaming dew drops dot the grass.

Oh happy month! Love, Joy, and Song,
And fairest flowers to thee belong;
And glad birds sing their sweetest tune
To greet thy coming, lovely June!

Ottawa.

M. L. M.

WHITNEY'S ENGLISH GRAMMAR.

IN all recent discussions of educational values it is taken for granted that mere instruction holds a very low place in any system of elementary education. The individual fact withers in importance before the type and method of the whole scheme of learning. Instruction, simply considered, and methodical training are coming to be more and more clearly discriminated. Tact-lore and thought-lore, material and pattern, matter and method, metal and mould, example and principle, information and education—these are clearly seen to have very different values and to be widely separated in their influence on mental development. The leading students of psychology and pedagogy constantly assign to method the highest place, and the lowest to merely useful information. A few are almost prepared to go the length of saying that it matters very little what we teach in the elementary schools, provided the subjects are sufficiently difficult to try the learner's powers. The all-important matter is to teach some definite, organized whole in such a way that the relation of all the parts is firmly seized by the understanding and permanently lodged in the memory. If thinking is the perception of relations, then the thinking faculty can be trained only while it is engaged in tracing out logical relations and connections, and the things themselves between which these relations exist are not of supreme importance in the first stages of education. If the subject in hand is carefully and scientifically developed from the beginning the fact-content of the subject is only a secondary consideration. A well-trained mind can, in a very short time, master all the useful details of any trade, art, profession, or occupation. The educated man easily makes the special application of general principles to any ordinary occupation, such as farming, teaching, book-keeping, mining, or physic. To use a homely metaphor, instruction is the cook that prepares various kinds of victuals out of which method masticates, digests, and elaborates mental blood suitable to nourish and strengthen every part of the system. The food of fact must be supplied in proper quantity and, if possible, of good quality, but, after all, thorough digestion is the affair of supreme importance in elementary education.

This doctrine is the key-note of the so-called New Education. In the first stages the main question is not so much *what* as *how* we learn, and the sum of the whole matter is expressed by the dictum: *The teacher is the school.*

It is in the light of this principle that we are slowly, but surely, rewriting our school-books for children and youths, so as to give a high place to the *method of discovery*, the great inductive method of modern times. Chemistry, physics, and arithmetic are largely taught on this plan, and even such "information subjects" as geography and history are presented by the same method.

In his "Essentials of English Grammar," Professor Whitney, of Yale College, has given an admirable illustration of the inductive method of teaching successfully applied to the study of our own language. From his complete knowledge of the subject naturally spring great

clearness and simplicity. But the value of his work as model teaching is enhanced by the instinct that leads him to use constantly two of the most valuable artifices of the teaching art, viz., 1. The choice of the very simplest language, and, 2. The omission of every detail not positively required for a lucid presentation of the subject. In these respects he is the peer of Freeman, Tyndal, and Darwin.

To know what to omit is one of the greatest qualifications of a great teacher, as witness the teachings of Socrates and Christ. Carlyle believes that an author should be paid not in proportion to what he writes, but in proportion to what he suppresses and omits; and Professor Whitney wisely says, on page 250, that "to expect young scholars to explain the real difficulties of English construction, is, in a high degree unreasonable; nor should such matters be brought before them at all until they have gained a thorough and familiar knowledge of the usual and regular constructions." And he is always consistent with this principle; in each individual chapter also he is true to the inductive plan of teaching general truths by a comparison of numerous particular examples.

But in the sequence of his chapters there is room for suspecting some dislocation in regard to the whole subject of the book.

After a short introduction on the nature of language and grammar, we study the simple sentence and the parts of speech in a chapter that illustrates very well the author's style and his great power as a teacher. The next ten chapters discuss the morphology of words, inflection, and derivation.

The position of these chapters within the book seems open to question. The influence of the Latin Grammar on even a thorough linguist who resists conventional tendencies in the special chapter seems to have come into play in deciding the order of the whole treatise. The salient topics of each chapter are treated on the individual plan; but the whole subject is unfolded in close imitation of the old Eton Latin Grammar. When we consider the science of grammar, as a whole, composed of closely connected parts, we seem to notice an immense dislocation in the framework of the book.

The opening chapters fully recognize the principles that (1) The sentence is the basis in the study of English Grammar, and (2) Induction is the proper instrument for developing the science. But on page 23 the author temporarily renounces his allegiance to the former of these principles and goes off into a long digression of more than one hundred pages on the inflections of the language. This seems to be as great an error in method as that committed by the old-fashioned arithmetics in placing Reduction, etc., before Fractions. The author's familiar acquaintance with highly inflected languages has apparently led him into an arrangement of topics wholly unsuited to a language where inflection plays a very subordinate part. Had he been writing an historical grammar of English the case would have been different, and this arrangement might have been appropriate. But in a first book of English Grammar, to make the third and nine following chapters treat of inflection is to desert the principles that (3) The grammatical value of each part of an English sentence is almost entirely independent of its morphology, that (4) The order of the words and their logical position in the sentence are of first class importance, and that (5) The fragmentary inflections still remaining in the language are, in fact, determined by the logical position of the word, and not *vice versa*, as in Latin or any other highly inflected tongue.

Fidelity to these principles would require our grammar to develop as a sequel to the simple parts of speech the important and far-reaching doctrine of *Substitution*. A "part of speech" is a part of a sentence, not necessarily a single word; phrases and clauses are also parts of speech, so that we often substitute a single word for a phrase or a clause, or even for a whole sentence, and conversely, a phrase or a subordinate clause for a simple part of speech; and the range of this substitution is extremely wide. Professor Whitney has partially unfolded this portion of the science in the latter part of his valuable book. But the various substitutes for the noun, adjective, verb, adverb, preposition, conjunction, and interjection are the appropriate subject-matter for the chapters immediately succeeding those on the parts of speech themselves. To introduce the comparatively unimportant details of inflection at this stage is to commit a violent dislocation to the neglect of weightier matters.

An adequate chapter on phrases is as yet almost unwritten in our text-books. Are not these important constituents of the sentence worthy of some separate attention and distinct study? Professor Whitney does not even define the phrase till he reaches page 118, and finds it impossible to present the conjugation of our uninflected verb without taking the phrase into account. Had he consistently developed the principles with which he started so well, this awkward quandary would not have arisen; the arrangements of verb-phrases in systematic order would have followed naturally as particular details connected with the general discussion of phrases previously given.

In passing we may note a point in the nomenclature of phrases which is worthy of attention from the standpoint of scientific method. The technical terms of a science are an important adjunct to the science itself by supplying a perfectly definite expression for a perfectly definite conception. Thus in grammar the words *adjectival phrase*, *verb phrase*, and *adverbial phrase* have a precise and well-settled meaning. They denote phrases having the respective values in the sentence of an adjective, a verb, and an