

thing else. Orangeism stands for liberty, he says, and for equal legal rights. But, if Orangemen secure the rights of the minority in Manitoba, with what grace will they contend for the minority in Quebec?

This is Mr. Hughes's question, and it will be well that Orangemen and Protestants in general should weigh it well.

The minority in Manitoba have a grievance. It is true that their educational rights are not guaranteed by the B. N. A. Act, for the simple reason that Manitoba was not then included in the Dominion. The Act of the Manitoba Legislature, however, established the Separate Schools, and although the same authority could, no doubt, legally put them down, such a measure could hardly be called equitable, and it certainly seems harsh.

One other thing may be said. Let the opponents of Separate Schools in Manitoba put themselves in the place of our rulers—of those who have to satisfy and to legislate for the different nationalities and religions embraced within the Dominion, and ask how they can be fair and just *all round*, and yet refuse a remedy for that which our highest legal authority has pronounced to be a grievance.

This is a matter which demands consideration, not from heated partisans, whether political or religious, but from those who can take calm views of the subject, and who wish only that justice and peace may prevail. It is for this reason that I have taken the liberty of asking for the insertion of these lines.

WILLIAM CLARK.

PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH

SIR,—Whilst most people here agree with the spirit and aim of your comments on the recent sayings of Professor Goldwin Smith, you have surely gone a little too far in saying that Dr. Smith must not say such things in Toronto. It may be quite true that, in former days, such utterances would have been treasonous, and that they are now very offensive to the great mass of Torontonians and Canadians; yet, before we say they must be stopped, we must show that they are illegal. If they are illegal, that can be proved in open court, where Dr. Smith, like other men, will obtain justice. If they are not illegal, there is no other way of neutralizing them but by public opinion, and this will undoubtedly prove effectual. Professor Goldwin Smith has positively no following in Canada, with the exception of a handful of men whom no one would ever think of mentioning as representative men in any good sense of the word. Not only so, but—what is still more deplorable—Mr. Goldwin Smith has lost nearly all the influence in this place which he previously possessed and worthily possessed on many grounds too well known to need mention here. Many of his friends have hoped that he would see the uselessness of his talk about annexation, and allow others to forget that he had ever put it forth. This, now, seems almost hopeless, and we can only regret that we have lost a man so well qualified to lead us in many respects, but whom now loyal Canadians will no longer be able to follow, or even to think of with patience.

JUSTITIA.

Toronto, January 6, 1896.

DR. GOLDWIN SMITH AND THE VENEZUELA QUESTION.

SIR,—You invite an expression of opinion from your readers as to the inexpressibly irritating position taken by Dr. Goldwin Smith on the Venezuelan question. What more can one say than that Dr. Smith's course in this instance is but another proof, if one were needed, that the man—refined, polite, able, though he be—is utterly devoid of that inspiring enthusiasm for native land which we call patriotism? Perhaps he has reached those cold heights of "pure intelligence" at which the blood ceases to thrill cheerfully through philosophic veins. Perhaps it is evidence of his high attainments as a ripe scholar and man of letters that the threat of savage war and dastardly invasion does not stir him to thoughts of a manly resistance, but only sets him casting about for new devices by which an unreasoning enemy can hurt and humiliate our Empire.

Thank God, in this case the Empire is right and the Republic wrong. If Britain must fight and we must defend ourselves, we shall bear ourselves manfully and with a good conscience. Decency and culture and fair play in the United States will lament the struggle, and in the end we must win,

for a free people cannot be long enslaved in the name of freedom.

But let Dr. Smith alone. You are wrong when you say: If he persists in these opinions, he must not express them here. Upon my mediocre soul, I am sorry for the man! How chilly he must feel up there! Does it ever occur to him to wish that his heart could throb warmly with the vulgar emotions of commoner people? Does it ever flash in his philosophic brain-pan that what we despise as a traitor is not far in advance of the cosmopolite, who, in face of a threat of war, can sit calmly down and calculate the chances, incidentally suggesting his country's weaknesses to the enemy? A moral sense so finespun, so exact, so unbiassed as between the Motherland and her enemies, so free from dross of human feeling, is not far removed from the moral senselessness of those we distrust and fear as enemies of society.

But let him alone. Our nationalism is sturdy enough to disregard and (seriously) to despise him. I am a Grit, Mr. Editor, and you, I sadly suspect, a Tory; but when the day of cruel invasion comes (as pray God it never may) you and I may be in the same company. For as there are no sects in Heaven, so in that day will there be neither Grit nor Tory in all our Canada.

And yet. Our fathers have had to fight in the past for a liberty as precious as our national independence. Free speech is a blood-won right of all our British people; and we must not violate it. No one, not even a traitor, must be deprived of it. We shall not preserve our national freedom long (nor indeed were it worth preserving) if we sacrifice to it our liberty as individuals. Let us not emulate the Venezuelan ideal (the ideal, too, apparently, of our republican friends to the south, since they prefer it vastly to an extension of the British "system") and clap our dissident editors into jail.

Leave Dr. Smith alone in his petty and peevish greatness and in his utter loneliness. For the present, if he is not quite above a craving for human sympathy, it must be punishment enough to know (if indeed he does know what you and I and all other people are assured of) that among those who turn with revulsion and bitterness from his present attitude are the most peace-loving and most generous hearts in Canada, those who most love and admire our kindred of the great Republic, and those who would most fervently deplore a civil war between us and them as a crime against humanity.

JOHN VARLEY MACDONALD.

Toronto, January 3rd, 1896.

MEMORIAL OF JOHN GREENLEAF WHITTIER

SIR,—Canadian readers and admirers of the poet Whittier will be interested in learning that an effort is being made by a number of his friends to preserve intact for future generations both the place of his birth and the house in which he so long lived at Amesbury. This quiet Quaker home, so entirely in keeping with the poet's simple, unostentatious character and life, is still carefully preserved, as it was in his lifetime. His birthplace at Haverhill, which, as also the scene of his beautiful idyl of "Snowbound," will always be one of the classic spots of New England, was, shortly after his death, purchased by the Hon. James Carleton and presented to the Whittier Club, by whom it is to be cared for and restored to its original condition, so that, like some other sacred places, it may stand unchanged through the changing years—a shrine to which, doubtless, many of those who have found inspiration and noble impulse in the poet's verse will often hereafter repair. The American trustees of the property—the members of the Whittier Club—believe that a large number of the friends and readers of the poet would esteem it a privilege to aid in the care and preservation of his birthplace, for which it is necessary to make a permanent provision. All such are invited to send their contributions to the Treasurer, Mrs. Mary Wood, Haverhill, Mass., who will duly acknowledge all such remittances, and, in return for a subscription of five dollars, will send a certificate of life-membership of the Whittier Club. A tribute so appropriate to one of the sweetest and purest poets of the century will doubtless enlist the sympathy of many Canadians who feel that verse like his is common property and forms one of the many bonds which unite by a far more than "threefold cord" the countries of Tennyson and Longfellow, Lowell and Browning, Burns and Whittier.

FIDELIS.