

THE OWL.

Vol. X.

OTTAWA UNIVERSITY, MAY, 1897.

No. 9.

TO MARY, QUEEN OF MAY.



LOWERS bloom in beauty, glowing with the light
Of life where late cold winter's pallid shroud
Wrapped a dead world ; like phantoms every cloud
Of snow hath vanished, while the blossoms bright
Write, Resurrexit ! on the mountain's height,
And valley's depth ; the hawthorne, sweetly proud,
Waves its white flag of peace ; a radiant crowd
Of witnesses in varied robes bedight,
Trilliums in royal purple, rhodora
In scarlet, dandelion in cloth of gold,
The bloodroot, silver-crowned, and manifold
Blooms vested in all vernal colors gay,
Attest 'fore heaven and earth, It is the May
That burst our bonds,—our gracious Queen behold.

And thou, O Mary, the long, wintry maze
That wrapped humanity in Arctic gloom,
Didst with the splendor of thy light illumine,
'Til man, enfranchised, in the glorious rays
Of his redemption saw the darkened days
Evanish, spectral memories of doom ;
Saw hope and joy, like vernal blossoms bloom,
When blest thy son, the Prince of Peace, his gaze.

Fitly to thee fair May is consecrate !
Earth and her children joyfully may sing
Anthems of all the promise of the Spring ;
The while they weave, with hearts and hopes elate,
Wreaths fragrant for thee, Queen Immaculate
Of Heaven. of May. Bless thou our aspiring.

E. C. M. T.

HON. JOHN COSTIGAN'S SPEECH.

For many reasons, we are pleased to be able to give our readers the complete discourse delivered by Hon. John Costigan during the debate on the Speech from the Throne. It is a noble evidence of thorough honesty and unflinching adherence to principles of right and justice. Mr. Costigan has represented the same constituency for a continuous term of thirty-six years, and has sat in the Federal Parliament since Confederation. His views, therefore, are of more than ordinary importance. Mr. Costigan has been a worthy representative of the Irish Catholics of Canada.—[ED.]

I have had the honour, Mr. Speaker, of a seat in the Canadian Parliament since the day the doors of that Parliament were first opened. I have seldom troubled the House with lengthy speeches, because I was, perhaps, not competent to interest the House with a lengthy speech. At the same time I claim that I have studied the convenience of the House in not inflicting myself more frequently upon it, and, therefore, I feel that I may rise now and ask the attention of hon. gentlemen for a short time while I say what little I have to say on the subject now before us.

Having sat in this House so long, I am proud to be able to say to-night that in my opinion the happy temper of the Parliament of Canada has not deteriorated. Even looking at the debate that has taken place, irregular in many ways as it is, I am happy to say that nothing has transpired to change my view on that point, and that, while subjects are discussed and references made here which might call forth very strong and very unpleasant expressions outside, no part of this debate has been offensive to any person within or without this House.

I find a difficulty in mapping out for myself the line that I should take in this discussion. But I will try to give expression to my views as they occur to me, and, beginning at the beginning, I may refer, at the first opportunity which I have of doing so, to the fact that I find myself on this side of the House instead of on the other side. On the 23rd of June last the elections went decidedly against

the party to which I have so long belonged. The Government of which I was a member was defeated in a very pronounced way. The policy however of that Government was sustained as clearly and definitely as it ever was in any previous election. Two principal features of the policy of the Conservative Government in the elections in June last were: first, the general trade policy, the policy of protection to the manufacturing industries of this country; and, secondly, the observance of the constitution of this country so far as it affected the rights of the minority in Manitoba. Now, I might have some difficulty in proving that our policy on the subject of protection was endorsed by the people of this country; but I think it is not beyond even my powers to establish that fact. That policy was clearly defined and laid down and voted upon in election after election during the previous seventeen years; it is confirmed by the commission appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, which has gone over the country to inquire into the subject; and, so far as I have been able to draw any conclusions from the evidence given before that commission, I take it for granted that the policy of protection is the policy which the Canadian people still want.

Now, with regard to the Manitoba school question, I take the ground that our policy on that question was amply sustained by the electors of this country, and I undertake to prove that assertion, in this way. Take the different provinces; take Manitoba itself, go down through Ontario and Quebec—and “en



HON. JOHN COSTIGAN M.P

passant" in Quebec, if you take the fact that every gentleman who was elected to support the hon. leader of the Government was pledged to at least do as much for the minority of Manitoba as we were, and pledged, as a rule, to remedial legislation, if local legislation did not remedy the evil—and you will find that the verdict of the people, on this matter, has been in favour of that policy of which we were the honest exponents.

Now, it may be asked how the Liberal leader obtained the support of the people on the trade question as well as on the school question. I am not going into that inquiry. He got their support, and, having obtained that support to carry out a protective policy, I am bound in honour to give him all the support I can, in order to carry out that policy. I do not know what the tariff may be. In my own opinion, looking forward, I would be surprised if it did not turn out to be strongly protective, and, so far as I am concerned, in that respect it would be quite acceptable to me.

With regard to the Manitoba School question, I must say at once that I had hoped that the policy of the Government would have been more in accord with what I consider has been the verdict in favour of the policy we adopted, and that a reasonable settlement would have grown out of it. That brings me to the paragraph in the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, in which we are asked to say that we are pleased to learn that after negotiations, a satisfactory settlement has been made. Standing in my place here, entertaining the views I have always entertained, with the record I have made for myself, for consistency at least, in a humble sphere, I could not subscribe to the statement that that was a satisfactory settlement, nor can I subscribe to the assertion that the Manitoba school question is buried. Not at all. There is no funeral, and if it would delight hon. gentlemen to attend the funeral of that question, it will have to be a mock funeral, for there will be no corpse. That funeral cannot take place yet. That question is not settled. There has been no reference in the settlement that I can see to the grievances declared to exist by the Privy Council. There has been no reference in it to the reasonable demands of the minority, and therefore it is a very great mistake for hon. gentlemen on

either side to say that this question is dead and buried. You might as well say that the constitution of the country is dead and buried. That question to-day, instead of being dead and buried, is in its full force and vigour. That question to-day is as much alive as the British North American Act itself. That question to-day, so far as the rights of the people are affected, is just as much alive as the constitution itself, and it will last as long if not reasonably disposed of. There is but one way to bury it, so long as the minority are not restored their rights, and that is by burying the guarantees given by the constitution to minorities. There is but one way to bury the guarantees given to minorities, and that is to erase them from the Constitutional Act. How can that be done? By the vote of this Parliament? No, thank God. You cannot do it by the vote of this Parliament. It can only be done by the powers that passed that Act. If any portion of the people have reason to think to-day that the fathers of confederation made a mistake when they gave these guarantees in good faith, when they pledged the honour of the country to the minorities of this country—at the demand of the Protestant majority, happily, for the Catholic minority—if they wish to say to-day that the constitution is wrong in that respect, does that give them any right to ignore the constitution? No, it does not. The constitution must be obeyed and ought to be respected while it lasts. If there is any part of the constitution that is inimical to the interests of Canada, then ask for the amendment of the constitution; and if there be good reasons for having it amended, the Imperial Parliament, no doubt, will make the amendment. Otherwise, I am sure it will not. I speak plainly on this subject because I want it clearly understood, from my point of view. There may be a number of gentlemen who differ very widely from me, but if I understand the constitution under which we live, when that little minority was deprived of its rights, when faith was broken with it, when it appealed to Parliament and its attention was called to the constitutional means by which redress should be sought, when it followed, step by step, those constitutional methods which were pointed out, when it went to the Ju-

dicial Committee of the Privy Council and obtained judgment, when that judgment declared that its case came within the operation of the Act of Confederation and pointed out what its grievances were and declared that an appeal lay to the Governor-General-in-Council for a remedy, when that appeal was made, and the remedial order passed, and when that remedial order was not obeyed, then the doors of this Parliament were unlocked to that minority. Then they came to this Parliament, and the Remedial Bill was introduced by a Conservative Government and carried to a second reading successfully by a Conservative Government, with a majority of Conservatives supporting it, which majority was increased by the support of other members of the House, thus affirming the principle of the Bill. From that date, within the limits of that judgment and within the limits of the Remedial Order, this Parliament was seized with the legislation on that subject and no power can take it out of this Parliament. I am not going to say that this Parliament can be forced to exercise that power now. The majority of this Parliament may say it is not wise to exercise that power, as a majority may say that the minority must submit to the settlement and must not ask us to exercise that power here at all, the majority of Parliament can do as they please; but the power and, to my mind, the obligation to legislate is here, and the question is not by any means settled. But I am not going to argue that point further. I have heard different speakers who have preceded me say that the question has not been settled and that what has been granted is an instalment. I do not like the line of argument taken by some of those who have spoken on that subject. Because, I want it clearly understood that on that question I am not speaking for party purposes or as an old Conservative, but that I am speaking as a friend of the constitution. I am a Roman Catholic, an adherent of the same faith as the minority in Manitoba. But I tell you solemnly, Mr. Speaker, standing in my place as a member of this House, that were I a Protestant I would take exactly the same ground. I speak as I feel about it and I speak candidly and honestly, I do not attack the Government or any member of the Government for any expression they may

have used in or out of Parliament to show the settlement is not final. I do not find fault with that. I find fault with the settlement because I have reason to know it is not satisfactory to the minority. You may talk about carrying by-elections, but outside of the one principally affected St. Boniface that does not alter my opinion at all. You may tell me that the French representatives in the province of Quebec, who are as much interested in the question, so far as sympathy is concerned, as I am, are satisfied. That does not affect my position. Well, yes, it does affect because it weakens my position; but it does not change my opinion, nor does it weaken the sense of obligation I feel resting upon me as a man elected to this Parliament and sworn to carry out loyally and truly the constitution of this country.

Let me for a moment touch upon the subject of the mission to Rome. I touch upon that reluctantly, for I feel that too much has been said about it already. In my experience, in discussing matters in Parliament, reference is frequently made and properly made to passing incidents of which we have notice from the public press of the country. But the House of Commons has never yet, to my knowledge, settled down to a prolonged debate upon a subject without some substantial information about it. If any hon. member will rise and tell me what the mission is or why the present ablegate has come to this country, I will be prepared to discuss it if necessary. But, not knowing that, and believing that none of my fellow-members know more than I do about it, I do not see that there is room for prolonged discussion. But, as the matter has been referred to, I desire to say a word about it. I listened to the document read by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Tarte) signed by forty-five members of the House of Commons, Senators, and members of the Government. The right of the hon. Minister of Public Works who, I know, signed that document and of the other Catholics who signed it, to appeal their grievance to the highest authority of their church, I do not call in question. I do not think that it is the business of anybody to interfere with them in the exercise of this right. With the reason which impelled them to make the complaint I have nothing to do. They have made a complaint, the

complaint has evidently been heard, and an inquiry is to be made into it. But I do find fault with hon. members on both sides of the House, carrying on a discussion about the substance of that complaint. I do not think it proper or delicate for members, especially from the province of Quebec, pending the inquiry, and pending the result of the visit of the distinguished Papal representative, to carry on a discussion about it. Now with regard to an ablegate coming from Rome to this country:—well, there is no wonder in that. It does not surprise the Catholic population of the country; it need not surprise our fellow-citizens of Protestant faith. They have sufficient knowledge of the organization of our church and its discipline to understand that that may be necessary and quite proper in the interest of the church itself. I am quite sure that any ablegate or delegate sent from Rome to Canada will acquit himself in such a manner as not to lower the dignity of the authority that sends him or his own. He comes to Canada as representatives of the Papal authority have gone to the United States and other countries and returned without setting the heather on fire. So that all that tempest in a tea-pot about the ablegate coming here and what he is doing here and what will be the result of his coming here, is mere speculation. And I do not like some of the references made on this subject. For instance, it is said that he is coming here to run this country. Well, that is too old, it is too ignorant a cry to be used in the Parliament of Canada. There is no danger of it, and when I say danger of it, I do not wish to be misunderstood. There could not possibly be any danger. He would be powerless, even if he were so lacking in common sense as to believe that he could revolutionize the constitution of this country, or interfere with the rights of Her Majesty's subjects in Canada. So I think a little too much attention has been paid to that; perhaps I may be reproached myself with having paid too much attention to it, but I have made my reference as brief as I could. I will simply add to what I have already said upon this school question, that I am precluded from adopting the grounds taken in the complaint made by certain gentlemen in Quebec against the hierarchy, for the reason that I

do not want to commit the same error—an error against good taste—that has already been committed in the House. I will go no further than to say that if I wished to discuss that matter, I could make a very strong case. I could quote several gentlemen to show that in appealing to Rome they took a very different course on a not very remote occasion. That does not affect the principle at issue at all. Now, the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. McMullen) reproached me with being mute on this subject. Well, he and I differ. I have often been silent, I have never been as fond of speaking as my hon. friend. The hon. gentleman paid me a good deal of attention when I was on the other side of the House, though I am not going to make any complaint that he was unfair. But he was very attentive to me as well as to other Ministers with regard to their estimates, and with regard to the management of their departments; and I thought, perhaps, that he would have allowed the occasion to pass without making any reference to my being dumb. The fact is, we are a good deal in the same position, I can sympathize with him, and I expected him to sympathize with me. I am out, having been in; he is out, not having got in. Now, I want to put myself right, not only myself, but my party, and especially my party. I have been trained in the Conservative party. I was trained under the noblest leader that ever led the Government, and the hon. gentleman sitting opposite, who occupies that proud position to-day, I am sure will not consider my remarks as any reflection upon him, (Mr. Laurier: "Hear! Hear!") I came to this Parliament, Sir, when it was first opened. I was not then allied with the Conservative party. I did not know anything about the Conservative party in Canadian politics. I came here against the combined influence of the Conservative party here and in my own province, and I was under no obligation to them. I allied myself with the Conservative party, not from any personal interests, but on broader grounds. I found at the head of the new Parliament and presiding over this new country, two great men, the late Sir John A. Macdonald, a Protestant, and Sir George Etienne Cartier, a distinguished Roman Catholic French Canadian.

These two names will live in the history of Canada, and their memories will ever be cherished by the Canadian people. The policy of the Conservative party enunciated by these two men was a policy broad enough for every man in Canada to support, their platform was broad enough for every Canadian to stand upon. Toleration, peace and harmony, and equal rights for all classes—that was the platform of the Conservative party. I believe it to be the platform of the Conservative party to-day; if I did not, I would not be here. Now, some capital has been made against us on this side, and hon. gentlemen opposite have taunted us as being a party simply in search of votes, and without any sincerity. I resent that. When some gentleman on this side rises and says something different from what I recognize to be the principles of the Conservative party, it is greeted on the other side with tremendous acclamation as a proof that we are a divided party. There has been no division that I know of in the Conservative party, except the division that occurred on the Manitoba School Question. That division was pressed; a certain number of Conservatives could not see their way to support the policy of the Government on the question. I have no means of punishing them; I have no desire to punish them; they were free men to do as they pleased. They attacked the Government, some of them at all events, on very strong grounds, and pressed the Government as hardly as they could to a defeat—not all, perhaps, but at all events, on that question many of them certainly preferred to see the Government go down rather than have their policy adopted. That was their business. They are not, however, exponents of what I understand to be the platform of the Conservative party or the policy for which we have fought, and for which I hope to continue to fight. Hon. gentlemen opposite must remember to be careful about applauding them; those hon. gentlemen would not applaud me to-night. They applauded hon. gentlemen opposite. They were allies of hon. gentlemen opposite during the Manitoba school discussion. An hon. gentleman to-day has boasted that that little band defeated the Remedial Bill. That little band could not have defeated that Bill.

Mr. WALLACE. They could try.

Mr. COSTIGAN. They could try and I know what they could do. It was because they received efficient help that the Bill could not be carried. I, therefore, say that so far as the Conservative party is concerned, it remains just as it was before. If the Conservative party to-day should say that the constitution of this country must be a dead letter then I am not a Conservative.

I do not want to go over the whole history of the debate on the school question, I will not be trapped into a discussion of the merits of separate schools, further than to say this, that I have always believed in separate schools, I have always believed in religious teaching in our own schools—I have no right to make a choice for other people's schools. But I lay down as a broad proposition that if you were to poll the votes of the Protestant people of Canada to-day, leaving the Catholics at home, leaving out the question of separate schools that has created a prejudice in many minds, leaving the Pope out of the question, and if you were to ask the Protestant people: Do you want schools in which religious instruction will be given or not,—I honestly believe that four-fifths of the Protestants of Canada would say: Give us religious instruction in our schools, mould the minds of the youth in that way, because from my experience I believe you would thereby bring up Protestant and Catholic children as young Christians; give them religious training when they are young and you will make better Protestant and Catholic citizens than if you send them to godless schools. That doctrine is sound and it is acceptable to Catholics and Protestants in this country. But a cry is raised against separate schools. Mr. Speaker, that cry has no foundation from beginning to end. An hon. gentleman speaking the other night said that if it were something new to ask Parliament to force separate schools on Manitoba—and I believe this argument will have some influence on the sympathies of some Protestants—he would not support such a measure. I think that is a fair interpretation of his words. This Parliament could not be called on to interfere; it has nothing to do with deciding as to whether a province shall have separate schools or not. All we have to do is to see that the

schools which were granted to Manitoba, as they were granted in Quebec to the Protestant minority and in Ontario to the Catholic minority, are maintained and respected according to the guarantee. We are not compelled to argue and prove our case that separate schools are better than common schools; we do not shrink from the argument if necessary, but it is not required. We remember the cry of coercion that went up to the effect that the Dominion was coercing the little province of Manitoba. Did it ever strike hon. gentlemen that the little province of Manitoba has been coercing the Dominion, has been violating the constitution and declaring to the people of Canada that the constitution so far as it regards that province, shall be a dead letter? That is exactly the position; constitution or no constitution, they say, you shall have no separate schools here. They will not say, of course, that they have broken that compact, that they have taken away the separate schools and will not restore them. No, they try to cloud the question, and make it appear that this country was coercing that little province and forcing on it a system of schools to please the Pope and the Roman Catholic hierarchy. When the people of this country understand the true issue, when they understand that the rights guaranteed by the constitution are being withheld, the Canadian people, irrespective of religion or nationality, will say: Keep faith with the compact, respect the constitution and carry it out. I should be very glad to see the hon. member for Toronto West (Mr. Clarke) take that position. I know what his views are upon this question, but it would be a generous and noble position for the hon. gentleman to take. He does not believe in separate schools, but in a national system. No one wishes to do violence to his belief, and if this was the first effort made to establish separate schools in Manitoba, I could understand the hon. gentleman saying. No, I do not believe in separate schools, and I consider that under the circumstances they will not work well. But what I would expect the hon. gentleman to say, under present conditions, would be: "You have had separate schools established there; I would not have voted to give you separate schools, but I belong to the Protestant majority in this country which boasts of giving

fair-play and of its willingness to give freedom to every human being, and we recognize the guarantee given in our name; we will vindicate our honour in Canada and uphold the rights that were guaranteed to you, which must not be sacrificed no matter whether I believe in separate schools or not." I do not expect to live many years to see a change that may take place similar to the change that has occurred during the past quarter of a century or even less; but if I were a young man like many I see on both sides of this House, young men beaming with intelligence, coming fresh from their constituents, some of them just entering the political arena to battle for their country and to contend for right against wrong, I should say that this settlement is scarcely an instalment and that justice will be done as surely as the sun will rise in the Heavens to-morrow. I believe that justice will be done. I have no more to say with respect to this question, except to answer an argument used by the Minister of Public Works which staggers some people who sympathize with the minority in Manitoba. The hon. gentleman took a number of schools in Ontario where Catholic children attend and said: There are so many Catholic children attending the public schools in Ontario, and they do not establish separate schools where they have the power to do so. Do hon. gentlemen not see that after all this is a fallacy? I do not dispute the accuracy of the hon. gentleman's figures, for I suppose he got them from a return. Let me present to the hon. gentleman my view. If he will look a little more carefully, he will find that in many districts in Ontario the population is divided and Catholics are so situated that they can have a school under the common school system and working under the common school law, but administered so that Catholic teaching can be given as it is in separate schools, and that while it is classified as a common school, yet on account of the distribution of the population there, so far as their religious training is concerned it is to all intents and purposes as good for them as if it were purely a Catholic school attended only by Catholic children. That is one of the conveniences that in Ontario arises out of the distribution of the population, and a broad and liberal administration of the Act. The

position of education in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick has been quoted by the friends of this settlement. Those who opposed remedial legislation have quoted Mr. Kenny of Nova Scotia, and they cite the New Brunswick settlement, and they tell us to look at the harmony that exists in these provinces. Well, Sir, there is no parallel in these cases to the Manitoba case. Why is there harmony in New Brunswick? In New Brunswick the minority lost their separate schools just the same as they did in Manitoba, and under about the same circumstances. The Government there swept away the separate schools which the minority thought were guaranteed them by the constitution of the country. The New Brunswick minority appealed to this Parliament, they appealed to the Supreme Court and they finally appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and the verdict there was, that according to law the minority had no case. As loyal citizens of Canada the minority in New Brunswick bowed to that decision. We thought it a severe decision, we thought it deprived us of rights that we believed were guaranteed as they were guaranteed to the older provinces, but, nevertheless, we bowed to the judgment. We are told now by gentlemen opposite that a happy condition of things exists in that province. Why? It is because in the administration of that law which swept away separate schools, compromises had been made in some of the cities and in most of the rural districts, by which the law is so broadly administered that separate schools are carried on in purely Catholic districts. But is that a constitutional right? We had in New Brunswick an agitation for three years and an attack upon the Government led by the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), because these concessions were given outside of the law. That shows you the position we are in. In Nova Scotia, to the credit of the province be it said, that while our constitutional guarantee was swept away, while we had not a vestige of protection under the constitution in Nova Scotia any more than in New Brunswick, yet the law has been administered by the Government of the day in such a way that harmony prevails upon that question, and

the Catholics there accept the concessions made to them for the time being. If tomorrow the administration in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia on some wave of prejudice or religious excitement were to close up every Catholic school in those provinces, is there anything in the law there or in the constitution here to prevent them from doing so, or to afford the minority any relief? Not the slightest. Then I say that while we are thankful, and while we cannot help paying a tribute to those men for their liberal treatment of the minority in their provinces, yet we are dependent solely upon their good will for any concessions given. So will Manitoba be dependent. But is it the same case? Manitoba says no. The minority in Manitoba say: We felt afraid to go into confederation without this guarantee. We felt that the majority might swamp us and that we might lose these rights. They have been swamped, and they now say: Give us that which you promised us at the time of confederation; give us that which the highest tribunal in the land declares is ours. Sir, their demand is a reasonable one. I heard a distinguished barrister in the province of Quebec quoting the judgment reciting the grievances that are found to exist, state that it is not absolutely necessary for a restoration of these rights that the law which was repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted. That is true. It is quite clear that all the grievances could be removed if the existing law of 1890 were supplemented by such legislation as would restore the rights or remove the grievances. The judgment lays down what the grievances are, and in proceeding to show how the rights of the minority might be restored, it points out two ways. One is by re-enacting the old law itself if necessary, and the other by supplementing the Act of 1890 by such legislation as will meet the wants of the case. This does not require them absolutely to re-enact the old law, and on that point there is no argument in saying, that the Catholic children who are attending the public schools in any part of Canada is an evidence at all affecting this Manitoba case.

Of course, Sir, a great deal can always be said on the subject of clerical influence. Some people have a holy horror of the influence exercised in political matters by members of the

clergy, especially clergymen of the church to which I belong. I have run a good many elections, and as a rule in my own constituency I have had a majority of the clergymen politically hostile to me. I have never made any complaint about that, and I do not complain now. I respect these gentlemen. I call on them when I visit my county, and I recognize their perfect right to oppose or support me just according as their conscience may lead them. With regard to the clergy outside of my own county, I have no hesitation in stating that the English speaking Catholic clergymen of my own province are largely Liberal. Now, I do not see why there should be a great deal said about this matter by hon. gentlemen opposite. In the province of Quebec, I do not know what the grievances are, but I do know this: that in the election that took place on the 23rd of June last—I heard it remarked all over the country—the people were surprised, and said, ‘This is a snub to the clergy and hierarchy of Quebec; they have been routed; they have been defeated.’ I never gave the result of the election that interpretation. It appeared to me that so far as the hierarchy and clergy of Quebec were concerned, the electors adhered very strongly to the principles laid down by them prior to the election. The clergy were neither Liberal nor Conservative; they were as neutral in their united action as it was possible for any set of gentlemen to be. Their mandement left every elector in the province of Quebec free to vote for any man he chose. On one question they asked him to see that the candidate he voted for would do justice to the minority of Manitoba. They did not say, vote for a Conservative candidate because he will do justice more surely than a Liberal candidate. I do not pretend to judge of particular grievances which hon. gentlemen opposite may happen to have in individual cases; but it will be hard to convince me that had the clergy been politically united against the premier it would have been possible for him to have turned that province, which was generally and largely Conservative, into what it is to-day as the result of the election, a largely Liberal province. Therefore I am bound to believe that that mandement did neither the hon. gentleman nor his supporters any harm politically, but left the electors as free as air to vote for the cand

date they preferred, Liberal or Conservative, having the assurance from the candidates on both sides that the case of the minority of Manitoba would receive their full sympathy and support. I want to endorse the sentiments uttered by some hon. gentlemen here, Protestant gentlemen, who say that there is no reason in the world why any clergymen in this country should not exercise, not only his franchise, but his legitimate influence in any election, or with any elector in the country. I want to endorse that sentiment on this ground, that if there is anybody in this country unqualified to advise their fellow-citizens in such matters, it is not the clergymen of any church, who are a body of educated gentlemen. From their education and from the dignity of the position they hold, it would be monstrous to say that they have not the right to advise an elector how he should vote; it would be presuming too much. You pay a man five dollars, and hire a cart and horse for him to go out and canvass for you. It is the custom in the country, not confined to one political party. Every candidate seeks to influence this voter or that voter, and you find men going throughout the length and breadth of the land canvassing, all exercising some influence, whose standing, whose integrity, whose intelligence, and whose education fits them much less to exercise an influence upon their fellow-citizens than the clergymen of this country, irrespective of creed. Therefore, I say that that is a legitimate exercise of citizenship even for a clergyman. Now, we have often heard that it was only our priests who have done this. I have before me to-night the report of a delegation, composed entirely of clergymen, and clergymen belonging to one church, that called upon the government at Toronto. Rev. Dr. Carman was the gentleman who introduced the delegation and spoke for them. He spoke as strongly about his church as any mandement that I have ever read. What did he say:

“Speaking of the confidence they felt that the government would bring down a measure that would reasonably meet the expectations of the temperance people, and especially of the body he represented, he said that, unless there was a genuine intention on the part of the government to protect the sobriety of the

people of the country, the Methodist Church must hurl its phalanxes at the polls against the men in authority."

That is as strong language as can be found in any of the mandaments that were issued. I do not wish to be understood as finding fault with that statement. I quote it simply to show that it is a legitimate exercise of a right claimed by all denominations in this country. Why, my reverend friend beside me here (Mr. Wallace), who has a very large following, will tell you in this House or on the public platform that if this thing or that thing is done or is not done, according to what he thinks is constitutional and right and just, the whole people he represents will vote solidly one way. Mr. Wallace denies this I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. He says I am perhaps going further than the fact. I am not going to discuss the point. That is my understanding of it. Now, on that question I have no more to add. I did not know that I would speak at all upon it. To my own mind it was not necessary that I should speak upon it. I required no speech to tell men who knew me where I stood upon the question; but my silence might have been misinterpreted if I had not spoken. I am prepared to vote for any amendment that may be moved to that particular paragraph referring to the school question, that would simply negative that statement congratulating His Excellency upon the settlement of this question. That amendment is not moved. No amendment is to be moved, as I understand, I do not think it very necessary that any should be moved for the simple reason that the question is not affected at all by this settlement which is announced in the Speech from the Throne. The negotiations between the two governments have ended. If the Manitoba minority accept that settlement, I do not suppose anybody here will rise to exercise the power which I contend still rests here. If the Manitoba minority accept that as a final settlement, I am not going to make any noise or to say that I am more interested than the people who are principally affected.

Now, I cannot sit down without a short reference to the Queen's Jubilee, and it must be short, because I am sure I could not add to the very eloquent expressions that have been given from both sides of the House on that paragraph which refers to Her Majesty's

Diamond Jubilee. I will simply say this, that I join in and endorse to the fullest extent, all that has been said by the two leaders in this House and the gentlemen who followed and spoke so eloquently on this paragraph, and while I, in my humble way, look with pride, as a loyal subject of Her Majesty, to the great development that has taken place all over the world, and particularly in that part of the world, which is considerable, that is enclosed within the limits of Her Majesty's Empire, when I consider the expansion of that Empire and the extent to which civilization has been promoted within her reign, what can I say but that it is the most wonderful Empire in the world, that it gives evidence of a wonderful amount of intelligence in the people especially of that little island, which, compared with the rest of the Empire, seems to be a speck in the ocean, and that no one can help admiring—one need not be a British subject to admire—the British constitution, the British Empire, and its history and its noble Queen. If we look, too, at all that had been done in her glorious reign, there is gratification for every subject. There is one little corner within the shadow of the Throne itself, that little green isle, and while I do not hesitate to raise my voice and join my fellow-Canadians in a just tribute of pride to that great and successful sovereign and the Empire over which she has presided so long and with such distinction, still when I think of that little island, I say that if, in that great monument that is to be raised at the celebration of this Jubilee, you could add but one tablet more and say that freedom had been given that little island which had suffered so long, with what an outburst would voices be raised from thousands of corners all over God's earth to join you still more heartily, but if that little tablet be not there, let no man say that an Irishman will not join in his best wishes for the success of the Empire. And let me say this, that the monuments that will be raised, in every form, to the glory of that great Queen and that great Empire will attract the attention of the civilized world, and I pray that Her Majesty may yet be spared still longer than that sixtieth year, and that before she descends from the Throne—which she has graced so long and so well, she will have the pleasure—for to her I know it will be a pleasure—to sign a bill giving to Old Ireland home rule as we have it in this country.

Reference has been made to the tariff. I would not attack that until we get it down, and I do not know that I will then very strongly, but I join all those gentlemen who have preceeded me in saying that I think it would be in the interest of the Government, as I believe it would be in the interests of the people, that no time should be lost in bringing it down.

With regard to the Franchise Act, let me say this. The announcement is not clear to my mind as to all that is intended. The paragraph reads: "That the franchises of the different provinces are to become the Dominion franchise." I can see some difficulty in that. First, as to the principle of this Parliament divesting itself of one of its most important rights, the right to frame and control its own franchise: but even if you adopt the provincial franchise, what franchise would be adopted? The provincial franchise of to-day, which would imply, of course, that any time any province amended its franchise, you would have to come back and amend yours, because I cannot believe it is the intention to adopt the provincial franchise, whatever it may be in the future. It is an objectionable enough proposition to adopt the franchise which we know exists in every province, but if you declare that whatever franchise any province may at any time adopt will be ours, there will be a considerable objection, because you would be committing this Parliament to something they knew nothing about.

In conclusion I want to make a very short reference to a matter that may not be very interesting to the House, but inasmuch as some reference has been made to it in the press, it is just as well that I should state very clearly where I stand. During the last few years I have been placed in a great many different positions. I found myself appointed sometimes to a collectorship, sometimes to something else, recently I have been transplanted into the arena of provincial politics, and so on. I told my constituents when I went to them last, that it would be likely the last time I would appeal to them. I am getting pretty sick of politics. I do not want it to be implied that politics are getting too hot for me or anything like that. I still retain, thank God, the confidence and

esteem of my constituency as firmly and as fully now as at anytime through the long years I have represented it, and if I do not go back, it will not be because I have shown the white feather, because I do not think there is any gentleman in the county or out of the county who enjoys the confidence I have enjoyed so long and still enjoy in it. This, of course, indicates that I am getting tired of politics and that I do not intend to continue much longer in it. I am sorry to see the Superannuation Act changed, because I might claim the maximum allowance on retiring. I do not want it to be suggested, either, that in retiring, I am looking for any position. I am on the wrong side of the House for that, gentlemen opposite are under no obligation to me. They would not offer me an office, nor would I think of asking for one. I am not inclined that way. My ambition is reasonably satisfied, and you will see how easily it is satisfied when I tell you that after thirty-six years I am, financially, just about where I started. So I do not owe much to politics, and I suppose politics do not owe anything to me. During this Parliament I do not know whether I shall be considered an out and out party man, an out and out Conservative or not. I should be sorry that any wrong impression should exist among my old friends. When I look about and see yet a few of the old guard, a few of the men with whom I have fought for a long time, I should be sorry to think that, because I was getting old and because I see that the time is coming when I might retire from politics, I was getting careless. Not at all; I am just as good a Conservative as ever I was. I was always an honest one and a true one, and I am that yet. And a consistent one, and I am that yet. I will fight as a Conservative every day that there is a fair fight to be given. But I will fight with legitimate weapons or not at all. I am speaking now, perhaps for the last time on this subject—it is the last time I shall make any reference to it in Parliament at any rate—and I want to be fairly understood. I do not wish to be considered as offensive when I say that I am just as independent of one party as of the other. The Conservative party never constructed or built me up. I came here having carried my county. I

became a Conservative and got my county to endorse the Conservative policy, largely, I think, myself; and I have contributed my humble share to the success of that party. In my own province I have done the little end of the work, perhaps, but that little was important and well done and honestly done. Now I am not going to take the same active part in politics as before. If any proposition ever comes before this House which I have advocated as part of the Conservative platform or policy, I will stand by it; I shall be bound to stand by it for my own self-respect. If I say that I am as independent of one side as of the other, the hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Laurier) will understand that I have no reason to be under obligation to those on his side, as they have fought me always. The hon. gentleman himself came down to my county and fought me pretty hard. I think he will say that I struck back as well as I could, speaking in French when necessary; and though he is an orator and I speak broken French, I think he will say that I hit back as hard as I could, but never dishonestly. I will pay the hon. gentleman one compliment—I can afford to do so, seeing that I carried the county—I can tell him that he was mistaken in his man, that he was unfortunate in his selection of a candidate. If he had taken hold of that candidate, that candidate probably would not have saved his deposit. The compliment I pay the hon. gentleman is to say that every vote over 150 or so, nominally, given to the candidate who opposed me—a renegade Conservative—was actually polled for the Prime Minister himself. Any man whom he endorsed would have got the same vote at that time. I have said—there is no necessity for saying it, but it is just as well to be plain about it, it is well that I should not be misunderstood—that I never looked to be shelved by my own friends, and I do not expect to be shelved by the hon. gentlemen whom I have opposed. I do not know of any vacancy I could apply for, and if there were a dozen, I would not apply for a position. I am not of the retiring kind in that sense. I intend to finish up this Parliament, to do my duty as a Conservative, and when the Parliament is at an end, unless my people absolutely think my services are required, I do not intend to trouble Parliament any longer, I have always said that if

my people wanted my services, while I was able to render them service, they could count upon me. This, perhaps, was a little irregular, but, for the reasons I have stated, and in view of the fact, that, in my long connection with this Parliament I have not taxed the patience of the House very frequently, even though I am doing so to-night, I trust I shall stand excused.

I presume that the Address will pass without a vote, but not without protest particularly with regard to the point which I have raised, the paragraph with reference to the settlement of the school question. If that Address passes on a division I will be satisfied, having given or tried to give my views in the few remarks I have offered. I will say this before I sit down—that, notwithstanding all the attacks that were made upon the Conservatives that introduced this legislation upon that question and went to the country, there has been no evidence, there can be no evidence produced to show that they did not act strictly in accordance with the pledges made to this Parliament, and endeavour to carry them out to the best of their ability. They failed; some said they pursued a mistaken policy which has been denounced by a prominent member of this House on the ground that looking after minority rights is not a paying business. Well, from a material point of view that may be true, but I do not, of course, share his view. I do not think that a man who represents a constituency and has the honour of a seat in the House of Commons of Canada, should weigh exactly the paying side of a question of right in any stand he takes on a matter of principle. The position the late Government took on that question of the Manitoba schools, I felt myself was the right one. Believing that we were performing a duty, fighting an obligation imposed upon us by the constitution, we would not have been worthy of our positions if we had not defended what we deemed to be right even had defeat stared us in the face. I think yet the day will soon come when that policy will be vindicated; but to argue that any more would be to repeat what I have already said, and weary the House, which I have no desire to do. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you, and through you, the House, for listening to a very unin-

teresting address from me. I want the House to understand the difficulty in which I found myself when I began to address you; I want the House to understand that it was not so much as to what I would say, but I had to study very carefully what I should not say—not that I wanted to withhold any of my own views, but I wanted to make no unfair charge against any man on either side of the House. I did not wish to break, in this last Parliament which I

may attend, the good feeling that has existed between myself and the gentlemen with whom I have worked so long. I wished to retain from the other side of the House that friendly courtesy that I have found in many quarters from gentlemen with whom I could not act, and in that way end a public life, a little stormy at times, in peace and quietness, so that I may take away with me the most pleasant recollections, and leave behind no very bitter ones against me.



GIVE TO CÆSAR WHAT IS CÆSAR'S.

All we have is God's, and yet
 Cæsar challenges a debt ;
 Nor hath God a thinner share,
 Whatever Cæsar's payments are.
 All is God's ; and yet, 'tis true,
 All we have is Cæsar's'too.
 All is Cæsar's ; and what odds ?
 So long as Cæsar's self is God's.



RELIGION AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT IN EDUCATION.

" See the sole bliss Heaven could on all bestow.
 Which who but feels can taste, but thinks can know ;
 Yet poor with fortune, and with learning blind,
 The bad must miss ; the good, untaught, will find ;
 Slave to no sect, who takes no private road,
 But looks through nature up to nature's God ;
 Pursues that chain which links the immense design :
 Joins heaven and earth, and mortal and divine ;
 Sees that no being any bliss can know,
 But touches some above and some below ;
 Learns from this union of the rising whole,
 The first last purpose of the human soul ;
 And knows, where faith, law, morals, all began,
 All end in love of God, and love of man."

It was Archimedes who boasted, that if he had a lever long enough and a place to stand upon in order to accomplish his herculean feat, he could move the terrestrial planet on which we dwell, as if it were a plaything. This great philosopher lived two hundred years before the dawn of Christianity, at a time when science was to the benighted world as an oasis in the great desert of Sahara. The astounding progress of science and art during the twenty centuries which have intervened since, and especially in our own enlightened nineteenth century does not seem to contradict this belief.

The genius of man has overleaped the barriers of time and space, enabling him to decipher the hidden wonders of the past, and to extend his discoveries to new worlds, limitless in extent, and countless in number.

In his geological researches he has ascertained with marvelous accuracy the mighty forces by which our globe has been developed through the dim cycles of unreckoned ages in virtue of

the creative fiat of the Almighty, he has marched intellectually over the immeasurable regions in the bosom of space, and has explored myriads of sidereal lands, incomparably larger than our tiny planet, which its inhabitants have proudly divided into zones and continents. He has succeeded in conveying his thoughts to his fellow-being in the antipodes, with more swiftness than if they were borne on the wings of the tempest, or carried on a beam of the morning.

Man, the paragon of the visible creation, has accomplished all this. He has held absolute sway over the domain of science and art ; but when he arrives at the boundless chasm which separates the finite from the Infinite, his energies are of no avail, and he must yield to a superior power.

The painter stamps the conceptions of his genius on imperishable canvas ; the sculptor gives to dull and inert marble the grace and majesty of life ; the architect designs structures artistic in finish and colossal in proportions,

but the educator of youth has to accomplish a task incomparably more sublime ; for he has to deal not with a material substance, but with the image of the Eternal.

His office is not only to develop and cultivate the physical and intellectual faculties, and so to furnish his pupil with a store of that sort of knowledge which has things temporal for its object, but he must devote himself to the formation of moral character ; to the rescue of the child from the vortex of earthly passions, the consequents of Adam's fall ; to remove the veil which obscures his mental vision and screens from his view everything which does not pertain to time ; in a word to bring him to a knowledge of the uncreated God, his final beatitude. To do this is certainly beyond mere human power and human means.

As there is no proportion between the natural and the supernatural, the finite and the infinite, the attempt to bring fallen man to his eternal destiny through the sole agency of his fellow-creature would be building a castle in the air, or making a voyage to the moon, a state of things which can be realized only in dreamland. Pope had a clear conception of this when he wrote in his "Essay on Man":—

"In parts superior what advantage lies ?
Tell (for you can) what it is to be wise ?
'Tis but to know how little can be known ;
To see all others' faults and feel your own ;
Condemned in business or in arts to drudge,
Without a second or without a judge ;
Truth would you teach, or save a sinking land,
All fear, none aid you, and few understand.
Painful pre-eminence ! yourself to view
Above life life's weakness, and its comfort too.

* * * * *
Alas ! not dazzled with their noontide ray,
Compute the moon and the evening to the day ;
The whole amount of that enormous fame,
A tale that blends their glory with their shame !
Know them this truth (enough for man to
[know])

"Virtue alone is happiness below."

God has established on earth an institution which is to last to the end of time, and in this institution alone are

men to find salvation. That branch of education, therefore, which has the ultimate end of man for its object must be inseparably connected with religion, that by their harmonious union man, both as a private individual and as a member of society, may attain the perfection in this world and in the next which the all wise and beneficent Ruler of the universe has destined for him.

Since, therefore, the object of education is to procure for man the end for which he was created, to ensure his happiness both in time and for eternity, it must be united with religion as its essential concomitant. All beings act in harmony with their proper nature, rendering homage to their Creator, each in his peculiar sphere of action. But man, the noblest and most exalted of God's works in the material world, the image of the Eternal Himself, has a special part to play in the harmony of creation.

Being endowed with the faculty of intelligence, and the prerogative of physical freedom, he must render to his Maker a homage bearing relation to his sublime destiny. And this he cannot do without religion, which like the golden ladder of Jacob, spans the chasm of eternity between the creature and his Creator.

The great social system of law and order, which binds man to man in one perfect society, is founded on the eternal law, or the conformity of all things with the divine will, ruling the universe. Since, therefore, man from his very origin is a social being, there must exist between him and his fellow-man that moral union of justice, affection, and truth, which is essentially necessary to the perfection of society. But how can this order of things exist if religion is banished from education ?

Again, human nature has lost its integrity by the sin of Adam. It has become subject to all the multiplicity of pains and evils which are the consequents of the fall. Stripped of all the transcendent gifts and qualities with which it was enriched in the begin-

ning, and reduced to the actual condition of fallen humanity, it can no longer rise to any intimate union with its Creator except by the merits of the Redemption. As the shipwrecked mariner, tossed about on the raging billows of the deep, threatened every moment to be swallowed by the angry waves, needs some kindly beacon to guide him to a haven of safety, so does frail human nature, subject to the whirlpool of earthly passions, require the beacon-light of religion to guide it across the bleak wilderness of earth to the sunny shores of eternity where the effulgence of the Sun of Justice forever dispels all fears and tribulations.

The tree of humanity, bereft of its foliage, withered and hopeless, must be restored to its former life and vigor. And to give it beauty and wholesomeness, fresh blossoms, and a rich store of fruit, it needs the sweet genial breath of Christianity. If education, then, is to accomplish its object, to lead man

to his destiny in time and for eternity, it must be imbued with the spirit of religion. It must not consist merely in awakening the dormant faculties of the child through the sole instrumentality of the educator; this would tend only to earthly perfection and would consequently fall short of the true end of education.

As a citizen of the world, man must fit himself for the Society in which he moves; he must possess a store of varied erudition; he must learn to conduct himself with civility and courtesy; in a word, he must possess all the qualities necessary for an active member of the Commonwealth. But as he is also an aspirant to eternal beatitude, all this is not sufficient. Omnipotence must come to his help to raise and ennoble his fallen nature, to break the fetters of worldly vanity, and to enlighten him with the light of sanctifying grace.

J. A. M. GILLIS '95.



THE CECILIAN MARCH

L. H. Gervais, O.M.T.

Allegro.

mf

mf

ff

1^{re} fois

2^e fois

The first system of musical notation for 'The Owl'. It consists of a grand staff with a treble clef on the upper staff and a bass clef on the lower staff. The music is in 2/4 time and features a complex, rhythmic melody in the treble clef and a dense, chordal accompaniment in the bass clef.

The second system of musical notation. It continues the piece with similar melodic and harmonic textures. Dynamic markings include *mf* (mezzo-forte) and *ff* (fortissimo). The notation includes various note values and rests.

The third system of musical notation. The piece continues with intricate melodic lines and a rich harmonic background. The notation is dense with notes and rests.

The fourth system of musical notation. The music maintains its complex texture. The notation includes various note values and rests.

The fifth system of musical notation. It features a prominent *ff* (fortissimo) dynamic marking. The notation includes various note values and rests.

The sixth and final system of musical notation on this page. It concludes the piece with a final chord and rests. The notation includes various note values and rests.

First system of musical notation, featuring a treble and bass clef. The music consists of dense chords and arpeggiated patterns. A dynamic marking of *ff* is present above the treble staff.

Second system of musical notation. It continues the dense chordal texture. Dynamic markings include *fine* and *ff* in the bass staff.

Third system of musical notation. The texture remains dense with chords. A dynamic marking of *pp* is visible in the bass staff.

Fourth system of musical notation. The treble staff shows a melodic line with some grace notes, while the bass staff continues with chords. A dynamic marking of *pp* is present.

Fifth system of musical notation. The music features a mix of chords and arpeggiated figures in both staves.

Sixth system of musical notation, the final system on the page. It concludes with a series of chords and arpeggiated patterns.



A BOUQUET.

TO MARY



WITH flowers I kneel thy face before—
 Red rose and myrtle, for my love;
 And constant ivy trailing o'er;
 And thoughtful pansies drooped above;
 And mignonette, whose leaves are wet
 With dreamy fragrance through and through;
 Love, constancy and thought of thee,
 And sweet to sweet, my lady true.

And here I place the lily white,
 For thee, God's lily, whiter far;
 And, here, forget-me-not, to light
 Remembrance with its azure star;
 And here I set the violet,
 In token of thy modesty;
 And here dispose the fair white rose,
 Sweet type of maidhood, fair in thee.

Alas! the blossoms droop for shame,
 And hold their breath, lest, being of earth,
 Their essence should receive a blame
 Before their queen of heavenly birth.
 Thou sweetest Rose in heaven that blows,
 And fairest flower of all that be,
 Whom Godhead through, a honey-dew,
 Deep drenches, breathe my God through me.

FRANK WATERS.

POINTS OF CANADIAN HISTORY.

THE QUEBEC ACT.

SINCE the conquest of Canada by the British, the question of its colonial administration has been a vital and most troublesome problem to the mother country. A glance through the pages of the history of the colony since 1760, reveals to us a succession of changes in its governmental constitution and geographical boundaries, which clearly demonstrates that if the subjugation of the country was a difficult task, the government of it proved a greater and more arduous one. From 1760 until 1763 we find it under Military Rule. This ceased with the issuing of the Royal Proclamation of George III, which established a civil government composed of a governor and council. In 1774, a new system was set up by the passing of the Quebec Act. To this succeeded the Constitutional Act in 1791, by which the colony was divided into the two provinces, Upper and Lower Canada. This was followed by the Union Act, in 1841, and afterwards by the British North America Act in 1867, which has continued to form the basis of administration until the present day.

All these are important and interesting points in the constitutional history of our country, and afford the essayist abundant material for discussion. To attempt to cover completely so vast a field within a limited compass, must necessarily prove futile. We shall, therefore, confine our attention in our present article, to the memorable Quebec Act, the passing of which marks an epoch in the history of our native land to which we may always turn with feelings of pride and satisfaction.

From the capitulation of Montreal, on September 9th, 1760, until the

conclusion of the war in Europe, three years later, Canada remained in the possession of the British troops whose valor had won the day. Meanwhile, the government of the colony was intrusted to military councils stationed at Three Rivers, Montreal and Quebec. The articles of capitulation guaranteed the inhabitants personal protection and the free exercise of their religion, together with the peaceful enjoyment of all their former habits and customs. The civil and criminal laws of the former regime were supplanted by those of England. But some of the religious orders met with less considerate treatment at the hands of the conquerors. The Jesuits, Recollets and Sulpicians were debarred of the rights and privileges they enjoyed previous to the conquest, until the pleasure of the king would be made known, and this, perhaps, is the most serious reproach which may be made to the victors. However, these were merely temporary arrangements pending the outcome of the war in Europe, when the final fate of New France would be decided, and the basis upon which it would be governed, established. Three years passed by in anxious expectation before the arrival of a settlement, during which period the colony enjoyed the profoundest peace, and began to recover from the evil effects of the late war. At last, a definitive treaty of peace was signed between the mother countries at Paris, on February 10th, 1763, by which Canada was ceded to Great Britain.

In the month of October following, King George issued a proclamation establishing Canada as a British province, and from this date began those dissensions and quarrels which form so painful and disgraceful a

chapter in early Canadian history. As no definite limits had been assigned to Canada by the Treaty of Paris, the proclamation established the boundaries. It is universally admitted that the description of these newly defined limits as laid down in this enactment is a masterpiece of absurdity and ambiguity. A quotation from the original instrument would amply verify this opinion, and prove most amusing, if not instructive; but we will refrain from any undue imposition on the patience of our readers, and content ourselves with briefly stating the generally accepted interpretation of this puzzling enigma. Anticosti and Magdalen Islands and the greater part of Labrador were separated from Quebec, and annexed to the Government of Newfoundland; the Islands of St. John and of Cape Breton to Nova Scotia, while extensive territory was joined to the New England States. This caused great discontent among the Canadians who justly regarded it as a dismemberment of the colony. What the intentions of the king were, it would be difficult to say, but it is certain that this part of the measure deprived the colonists of many natural advantages they formerly enjoyed. The proclamation also decreed that "so soon as the state and circumstances of the colony will admit," the governor "should call a general assembly to make, constitute and ordain laws, statutes and ordinances for the public peace, welfare and good government of the colony and inhabitants thereof, as near as may be agreeable to the laws of England; and in the meantime, and until such assembly can be called, all persons inhabiting in or resorting to the colony may confide in the royal protection for the enjoyment of the benefit of the laws of England." Moreover, authority was given to the governor to establish courts of judicature and public justice. General Murray was appointed Governor-General, and at once assumed the

responsibilities of that office. The great exodus of French colonists between the years 1759 and 1763, was now in some way counterbalanced by the arrival, or we might better say, the intrusion of upward of four hundred English Protestant settlers. In his private instructions the new governor was ordered to require the "new subjects," as the French Canadians were then styled, to swear allegiance to their new sovereign, to make a declaration of abjuration and to surrender all arms in their possession. The first of these requirements met with ready and prompt compliance, but the other two were extremely obnoxious, and were stoutly opposed. In the Treaty of Paris, provisions had been made for the religious and political rights of the inhabitants of the newly ceded province. In the fourth section of this instrument they were granted the free exercise of the Roman Catholic religion "*as far as the laws of Great Britain permitted.*" The true meaning of this imposed condition now became a fruitful source of discussion and hostility between the settlers. At this time, it will be remembered, the odious statutes by which Catholics were debarred from all official positions in the realm, were in full operation in England. The Protestant minority in Quebec claimed that all the laws of the mother country were now applicable to the colony. On the other hand, the French Canadians objected to such a rigid construction of the imposed restriction, and maintained that these words did not render them subject to the tyrannical laws which were at that time oppressing their co-religionists in England, and in this contention they were supported by the most eminent legal authorities. In this trying and unsettled state of affairs the governor adopted a conciliatory policy, the prudence of which prevented any very serious rupture between the two classes. Instead of a complete abrogation of all the ancient laws, a compromise was

made, by which all criminal cases were subject to the laws of England, while civil grievances were adjusted according to those in vogue previous to the conquest. The considerate treatment of the governor won for him the respect and gratitude of the French, but rendered him extremely unpopular with the intolerant newcomers, who clamored against his wise and prudent administration, and succeeded in having him recalled. His successor, Sir Guy Carleton went still further and drew up a code of laws, many of which were taken from the French statutes, and was even in favor of admitting Roman Catholics to the same positions as the other colonists.

Thus we see how the Royal Proclamation was unsatisfactory to both parties, The Protestant minority claimed ascendancy, and petitioned the king to grant an assembly, as promised, from which all Catholics should be excluded. The Canadians witnessed the dismemberment of their colony, the extirpation of their language and the abrogation of their laws with distrust and complaint. The conduct of the home government during this chaotic state of affairs was apparently one of indifference and neglect, but they were aroused from this tepid inaction by the rising symptoms of the American Revolution, and finally decided to take the matter into serious consideration. As a result of their deliberations Parliament passed a statute in 1774, styled "An Act for making better provision for the government of the Province of Quebec in North America." This piece of legislation is known in Canadian History as the "Quebec Act."

As already mentioned one of the causes of the dissatisfaction of the Canadians was the narrow limits to which the colony was reduced in the king's proclamation. The Quebec Act removed this grievance by extending the boundaries of the province as far as the Ohio valley. Thus Quebec at that time comprised not only the

present provinces of Quebec and Ontario, but included five states of the American Union, and a part of a sixth viz., Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and a portion of Minnesota. Although this generous policy of the Imperial authorities was, no doubt, dictated by the critical state of affairs in America, the French were none the less benefited by it. We can form an adequate idea of the advantages afforded by this part of the act, by considering how valuable an acquisition these states would be to the Dominion to-day.

The next and probably most important feature of this statute, is the provision made therein for the maintenance of the Roman Catholic religion. In the fourth section of the Treaty of Paris the victors were pledged to full toleration of the *Romish* worship "as far as the laws of Great Britain permitted." But we have seen how tolerant and friendly our separated brethren were after the conquest. That the difficulties which ensued were foreseen is evident from the action of the French minister who signed the treaty. Objecting to the phrase "as far as the laws of Great Britain permitted" he wished to have the words *comme ci-devant* inserted instead, so that the Catholic religion should be exercised in the same manner as formerly, nor did he desist from this point until informed that the king had no authority to tolerate that religion otherwise than as stated. It is therefore clear from this that the sole object of this restriction was to deprive the Catholics of all legal rights in the country. However in the Quebec Act we see a change of policy in this matter. In the fifth section of the act it is declared "that his Majesty's subjects professing the religion of the Church of Rome, in the said province, may have, hold, and enjoy the free exercise of their religion, subject to the King's supremacy, declared and established by an act, made in the first year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. . . . and that the clergy of the said church may hold, receive and

enjoy, their accustomed dues and rights, with respect to such persons only as shall profess the said religion." It was provided moreover that no person professing the Catholic religion should be obliged to take this oath of supremacy. In its stead was substituted a form in which the subject merely swore and promised fidelity and allegiance to his lawful sovereign. All commissions and ordinances of the proclamation disabling the new subjects of civil rights were repealed and the condition of the French Canadian was now practically the same as that of the English settler. The consideration granted in this measure to the Catholic inhabitants and clergy is worthy of special notice, and receives greater prominence when we remember the attitude of Parliament towards subjects of the same persuasion in England. Considering the policy of the ordinance of 1763 with that here adopted we observe a marked contrast. In the former we see the iron hand of the conqueror haughtily and tyrannically enforcing his yoke upon a tranquil, but unfortunate people; in the latter we seem to feel the paternal solicitude of a kind and wise prince, anxious for the prosperity and welfare of his devoted subjects. In 1763 the Catholics were insulted by being asked to take the oath of supremacy, and to deliver up all arms in their possession, both exceedingly distasteful to them, the former on account of being against the fundamental principles of their religion, the latter as being a distrust of their fidelity and a disgraceful insinuation on their honor. Now their claims receive just consideration, and all their grievances ample redress and satisfaction. Their clergy who formerly had been treated with contempt, and regarded as promoters of anarchy and discord, now come in for a share of the beneficence of the king. Truly are we justified in saying with the great historian Lecky, that the Quebec Act "marks an epoch in the history of religious liberty."

We now come to the third feature

of this measure, viz.: the re-establishment of French civil law in the province. By one of the ordinances of the proclamation, all laws, both civil and criminal, in practice under French Rule were abrogated, and the English forms substituted. The news of this measure was anything but agreeable to the *habitant*, who neither understood the nature of English procedure nor the language in which cases were heard and discussed. It is true that this was modified in some degree by Governor Murray, but the change as made by him was not a permanent establishment, and it is not until 1774 that we are to date the re-institution of French civil law in Canada. In cases of a criminal nature, the old English practice continued to be used. However, "small favors are always gratefully received," and this act of the Imperial Parliament had its little effect in conciliating the French.

The third and last point of this measure which claims our consideration is the establishment of a Legislative Assembly. In this we again observe a "politic stroke" on the part of the home government. In 1763, a general assembly was promised to the province "so soon as the state and circumstances of the said colony will admit thereof." The Protestant settlers were continually petitioning for the establishment of such a representative house; and urged that all Catholics should be excluded therefrom. But these insolent demands we justly and prudently refused. The British Parliament did not see fit to establish any such institution in Canada at that time, and in 1774 when action was taken in the matter, the same rights and privileges were given to both nationalities. Instead of an Assembly as petitioned for, a Legislative Council was granted, which was to be composed of not more than twenty-three, or less than seventeen members. This was a serious rebuff to the impertinent and arrogant demands of the English

settlers, but had both the motive and the desired effect of securing the adhesion and gratitude of the Canadians to Britain in a time of sorest need.

Such were the salient features of the Quebec Act. But to what are we to attribute the change in the policy of the Imperial Government, or how are we to reconcile the conduct of the king in 1763 with that embodied in the Act of 1774? Had a "change come o'er the spirit of the dream" of George III, had the storm of bigotry and intolerance subsided, or had a revolution taken place in the minds of the English legislators? Alas, no, but a revolution was brewing in the American Colonies, which disturbed the minds of all British statesmen, and Canada was at last to receive attention and respect.

Various, indeed, are the aspects taken of this measure. Most historians maintain that the measure was one of expediency, dic-

tated by the state of affairs in the other colonies. Others hold to another opinion, and regard the Quebec Act solely as "a legal monument of British justice, generosity and fair dealing," and not actuated by any other motives. Probably if we accept both views we will have a correct notion. Its leading characteristic is the political sagacity displayed in all its parts. That the measure was one of justice, and afforded relief for all existing grievances, none can deny, but the theory that it was dictated by any other motives than those of fear and expediency is unsupported either by the facts of history or common sense. If to-day, England can refer to Canada as the noblest of her possessions, and has the glorious privilege of seeing the Union Jack floating on Parliament Hill, she can point to no other cause for this than the passing of the Quebec Act.

W. P. EGLESON, '99.



So, in the passing of a day, doth pass
 The bud and blossom of the life of man,
 Nor e'er doth flourish more, but like the grass
 Cut down, becometh withered, pale and wan:
 O gather then the rose while time thou hast,
 Short is the day, done when it scant began;
 Gather the rose of love while yet thou mayst
 Loving be loved, embracing be embraced.

TASSO.



SIR W.M. HINGSTON'S SPEECH.

We give below the full text of Sir Wm. Hingston's able and solidly Catholic speech in the Senate on the Manitoba School question. The speech is a splendid exposition of the true principles that should guide law-makers in their dealings with the complicated and delicate subject of education. [ED.]

I listened with a great deal of interest to the able speech from the hon. gentleman on this side, who was so severely logical, however, that I found it difficult to follow him in some of his arguments, and in one in particular—that the more we exported, and the less we imported, the worse for the country. I was under the impression that the more our exports exceeded our imports the greater the wealth of the country; in other words, that the more we earn and the less we spend, the richer we become. Whenever I have leisure, I shall be glad to sit at the feet of my hon. friend and learn those lessons in political economy which at present are new to me.

With regard to the address, so much has been said that I shall simply go over the ground hurriedly. The enlargement of the St. Lawrence canals commends itself to all; and the Intercolonial Railway terminating in Montreal is a wise measure, which I think should have the support of this House. As head of ocean navigation, Montreal is, geographically speaking, a city that cannot be overlooked in any wise legislation. The same with regard to cold storage on ocean vessels; but here let me remark that hitherto there has been

MORE COLD STORAGE PROVIDED

on steamers than has been availed of. One ship-owner in Montreal told me that he constructed storage arrangements at an expense of (I forget how many) thousands of pounds upon fast vessels, and he had yet to receive his first contract, and, with it, his first dollar, to carry provisions across to the other side of the Atlantic.

With regard to the Behring Sea claims, we approve of any measure between the United States and Great Britain with a view to a fair

and amicable settlement; but it is for the United States and Great Britain to settle those questions and not for us, however interested we may be. As to the Indian famine fund, I am proud, as a Canadian, that we have done our fair share, and are still doing it to come to the relief of those who differ from us in language and in color, but who are subjects of Her Gracious Majesty and our fellow-beings. The allusion to the Queen and the Diamond Jubilee is well thought of. Our feeling towards Her Majesty is one not only of loyalty but of devotion and admiration—nay, I might say almost of adoration—of one of the noblest and best sovereigns any country has ever had. And so soon as she shall have passed away—and may it not be in the near future—I think that Justin McCarthy's words will come true that Great Britain has had in her, the greatest monarch probably that ever occupied a throne. A measure we are told, will be submitted for the revision of the tariff, which proposes to make our fiscal system more satisfactory to the masses. Of course any improvement in that respect will receive my support. Then the next subject referred to is

THE SCHOOL SETTLEMENT.

Do the advisers of the Crown who have put the word into His Excellency's mouth know the meaning of the word? A *settlement* is supposed to be something final. It means an adjustment of differences; in which both parties to the adjustment or reconciliation are agreed, and content; yet, by members of the Government in both houses we are told it is not final. Arrangement is the word I should have preferred, or a *modus vivendi*, or a *modus pati-*

endi rather. An arrangement, or settlement, as it has been called, has been come to between the representatives of a distant province and the Government of this country. Well, hon. gentlemen, the less a question is understood, the more is said about it and the greater is the confusion in our ideas regarding it. I find nothing in the natural world more resembling this question than one of those optical illusions which occur so frequently in the west, and nowhere more markedly than in Manitoba itself, where, in a particular condition of the atmosphere, the sun's rays falling at a certain angle upon a sometimes distant scene, gives the appearance of terrestrial objects in the heavens, the size and shape of which depend upon the position of the observer. The man at one place sees them clearly; and the one a few thousand yards away does not see them as clearly, or perhaps does not see them at all. If he sees something, it is not like what others see. And so, on this question—a question of conscience—which only those who take a conscientious view of the question can begin to understand, or to realize. What is the condition of this subject at the present time? It is simply this: From one end of the country to the other we have been promised a settlement. That means, of course, a settlement that will be satisfactory to all, and especially to those chiefly interested. Let me ask you, judging from the opinions that have been expressed in pulpits, at public meetings, in assemblies and in social life—let me ask you if the settlement that has been reached is a satisfactory one? Has it been a satisfactory one to those who are most deeply interested?

Several LOU. members—No, no.

Sir William Hingston: You answer no! One might as well put a worm on a hook and ask is it satisfied because it ceases to wriggle? No.

IT IS NOT SATISFACTORY.

and here I am sorry to say that I cannot agree with the speech from the Throne when it says: "I confidently hope that this *settlement* will put an end to the agitation which has marred the harmony and impeded the development of our country." What a grim savagery is there in the word *settlement* in this connection! There is no man in this community who could wish more than myself to see this question disappear forever and forever; but it

cannot be carried away upon the shoulders of injustice. The settlement, I say emphatically, is not satisfactory. It is not satisfactory to those most interested. It is not satisfactory to those who love the good name of our beloved country and which, hitherto has shown her respect for established privileges and rights, and I think it is our duty to say so. And here I shall take the liberty to read some words that fell from the hon. leader of the Opposition, and I hope they were duly recorded. When he was twitted about the change that had taken place in the feelings of the people of the Province of Quebec—how they were misled, or bamboozled, I should say—what were his words? He did not care how the people of the Province of Quebec had voted; it was not a question upon which the people had a right to vote. It was not for the people of the Province to say that an injustice had or had not been done when the highest tribunal in the world—the Court of last appeal—had said an injustice *had* been done. Now, what is the defence set up by those who favor the settlement? First: that it is all that can be granted; second: that it is all that is necessary; and third: that it is all that the minority had a right to expect. Now, to the first, I should say: What was the intention of the Privy Council's decision? Nothing is clearer than that it was

INTENDED TO MEAN THE RE-ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHOOLS

such as existed, or something to that effect, that would bring justice, relief and satisfaction to a section of our people. To the second, I should say that it is not at all sufficient; that the time devoted to religious instruction, (one half hour in the afternoon) is illusory; that it is not satisfactory, and worse than that, that it is deceptive. It would be farcical were it not so serious. It cannot be made satisfactory and why? I am not talking now of the religion of any particular sect, nor of any form of religious belief. I am speaking of the question of education proposed, as one from which religion has been excluded, as a non-religious, rather than irreligious education. It is impossible to carry out a measure of that kind and give to the people the religious instruction to which they have been accustomed for four-fifths of a century. Thirdly, we are told that "the French Canadian population of Manitoba is numerically

weak ;" there are but a few thousand, and why have so much trouble?" Well, hon. gentlemen, if fifty, or one thousand French Canadians in that district are zeros, how many times would you require to multiply the figures to make them more than zeros? Fifty zeros, after all, are but zeros ; and a thousand zeros are simply zeros. I cannot see that it can be questioned for a moment that an injustice has been done to a minority that is not a zero in the eye of the law, nor in the eye of God, nor in the eye of any fair or impartial man, and I shall lay before you a very short statement of the reasons for this statement. Now, there are constitutional reasons, and there are reasons of conscience. And as to the first, the British North America Act guaranteed provincial rights, and among those rights were separate schools and schools for minorities. The protection of minorities is a necessary corollary. Any contravention or abolishment can be appealed to the Federal Government, which has the power to annul such legislation, and that is what is desired. Now, the minority in Manitoba claims that its

RIGHTS WERE ABOLISHED.

They had schools from the very beginning, from the earliest days; when the red man, and the *coureur du bois*, and the Hudson's Bay servants were the only colonists. The first missionaries were sent from the Diocese of Quebec by Bishop Plessis, whose episcopal jurisdiction, at that time, extended from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Did they go uninvited? No Missionaries of the stamp of Mons. Provencher and Mons. Dumoulin do not often wait to be invited; but on this occasion the highest authority at the time, Lord Selkirk, on behalf of the Hudson Bay Company, had invited them to come and establish churches and schools, and they responded. When Monseigneur Plessis, the Bishop of Quebec, sent them, he gave them definite instructions. And what were his instructions? To instruct those Indians, but before he sends them, he sends his instructions to the Governor, who, to the missionaries, answers that the instructions are wise. You will build churches they are told. You will raise schools. What schools do you suppose they were to have? No more doubt as to their character than as to the character of their churches. They are there in undis-

turbed possession for four-fifths of a century and the Hudson Bay Company, to show their appreciation of their work, gives them land to build upon, and money to help them to build their schools; endows those schools, and continues to give them money every year. The Episcopalians wished *their* rights recognized, and the Hudson Bay Company gave them land also; and by-and-by the Presbyterians claim a share and get some 15 per cent. of what the others received. Thus it was recognized that the schools were separate and distinct, *ad initio*, the Presbyterians teaching according to their belief; the Episcopalians in their way, and the Catholics in theirs. A missionary report of the time says that when a school was to be built they had simply to ask the Government of the Hudson Bay Company for a piece of land and it was given, and for money and it was furnished. The Hudson Bay Company well recognized that the missionaries

WERE THERE FOR THE GOOD OF THE COUNTRY,

to teach the Indians to forget their savagery and to become Christians. The missionaries taught the Indians and half breeds virtue and economy and to be true and loyal to the Throne. One of the Commissions to Messrs. Provencher and Dumoulin reads thus :

9. "Les missionaries feront conaitre aux peuples l'avantage qu'ils ont de vivre sous le Gouvernement de Sa Majesté Britannique, leur enseignant, de parole, et d'exemple, le respect et la fidelité, qu'ils doivent au Souverain, les accoutumant à adresser à Dieu de ferventes prières pour la prosperité de sa Très Gracieuse Majesté, de son Auguste famille et de son Empire."

When this matter was alluded to in the other House it was said : "What business had they with that? That was a political question." A political question forsooth. So far for constitutional reasons. But there are

REASONS OF FAITH AND CONSCIENCE.

While listening to the discussion on the tariff and cold storage, and the rest, I recognized their importance; but they sink into utter insignificance compared with this question of conscience, and upon your decision depends the question whether we shall have a good, loyal, honest and contented people, or shall leave them to drift as they will, smarting under a sense of injustice a soured

and discontented people. They should come to appreciate what religious education means and to recognize God in every step of life, to recognize Him everywhere and not put Him in the background as a deposed statue or idol out of fashion which is set aside when fashions change. Religion must be in the heart; it must be taught. Who teaches the child? Answer: the parent. The parent never relinquishes his right over his child. He educates the child; but supposing he himself is not educated or has not the time, then he educates it by deputy—he gets a master who will teach the child. The answer is plain: It is their right, and their duty not less than their right, to bring up their children according to their consciences. It is therefore a question of conscience—a very serious question to interfere with—and when interfered with, imposing serious responsibility upon him or upon them who deprive the people of that right. It is the sacred right and duty of parents who beget the child and not the State—which is unequal to the function—to bring up the children. The State, exercising a general surveillance in the matter. Now, it is apparent, that when men, situated as those of the minority in Manitoba are, undertake what they have undertaken; go to the expense of such costly appeals; and at present, when despoiled of their schools,

REFUSE TO ACCEPT THE CONDITIONS

of the Government, and in the face of every difficulty, at the greatest of personal and financial sacrifices, begin the opening of private schools while paying for the maintenance of public schools, is it not very apparent that some intense conviction, some grand underlying principle must be at stake—must be the motive of such heroic endeavor? You have not the advantage that I have of being in a French Canadian community, where the *Bon Dieu* is everywhere; everything in their houses to remind them of Him, and everything in their books and teachings is of the wisdom and mercy and unbounded love of God. Is it an advantage or not to have children educated in that way? Now, the school, as I say, is simply a fire-side, so to speak. Myself, speaking as a parent, I shall say: I may be competent to teach my children, but I have not the time; and I send them to school, and what do I say now? Calmly, deliberately, fearlessly, that

having given to my children the best education this country could afford, if I were asked now to choose between the religious instruction they have received, and their mathematical and classical instruction, I would say, if choose I must, then reading and writing, classics and mathematics must disappear. I would not weigh them in the balance any more than I would weigh the matters of time in the scale with those of eternity. That is the feeling which animates that minority,

THAT POOR, DISTRESSED MINORITY, at the present moment; and when I am told in the address that this—what shall I call it—this abortion—this would be enforced “settlement”—is to put an end to the heartache of that simple and religious, but too confident, people, I say no, it will not. They will not rise up against it. No; as good loyal subjects, they will conform to the law and will pay to the Government what is asked for public schools, but at the same time they will work if needs be beg, to raise funds for their own schools. I had the sweet satisfaction recently to be permitted to put my hand into my pocket and to give according to my means in order that the dissatisfied might be instructed according to their consciences. When I first learned that the present leaders of the Senate had consented—reluctantly, it seemed, at the time—to accept the portfolio of Justice, I must say it was with great satisfaction. I thought: ‘Here is a troublesome question coming up, and there is no man whose abilities as a jurist better fit him to unravel it.’ He ruled the destinies of Ontario for many years with phenomenal ability, and on many occasions he carried her legal cases across the Atlantic, and generally with success. All that is necessary for a man of that great legal mind is to exercise his rare abilities in the direction which is its wont, and all injustice to the minority in Manitoba will soon disappear. I must say I do not recognize the work of either his head, or his hand, or his heart, in the so-styled “settlement” which is before us. Now, what are public schools? They are schools where there are all religions among the pupils and not necessarily much of any religion in the teacher, and none, none whatever, in the matters taught, for religion must of necessity be eliminated from a non-religious school. This kind of school is

THE VERY REVERSE OF THE HOME, and yet the school should be the mere extension of the home and of its sweet and healthful influences. Hon. gentlemen have noticed the struggle that is going on in Germany and France, and no one would wish to see our French-Canadian people in Canada reduced to the condition of the people in the latter country, where God is banished from their schools and too often from their hearts. In Germany forty years ago, where I was at the time studying, I rarely or never met a young man in my own profession, who believed in Divine revelation, and I recollect having been in a group of thirty young physicians on one occasion and not one of them believed in God. The Atheists would deny the existence of God, not aggressively, but silently and sullenly, but the Agnostics, who pretended to know nothing about the matter, spoke and argued as though they knew everything about it, and that was the difference between them. And what was the result? I shall not offend the susceptibilities of anyone present by stating the result, but all thoughtful men are of opinion that it was an unhappy day when religion was banished from the schools in Germany. And we have a worse state of affairs in France. Is France to-day what it was one hundred years ago? It is as much below in morals as the earth is below the heavens. Some time ago I read what occurred in a French court of justice. A young man was brought up for murder and the evidence was clear and positive against him. The lawyer, instead of pleading that he was innocent, said: "I plead guilty, but in whose behalf do I plead guilty? Not the prisoner's is the guilt, but yours, gentlemen of the jury, every one of you, and your's most learned judge upon the bench, for you have dismissed and put aside every emblem of religion and all knowledge of Christ, and how can this young man learn his duty with religion entirely ignored? The commandments of God have been kept from him, and he cannot learn them by studying division or the multiplication table." The young man was condemned, and the jury went on their way forgetting, if they could, that they had a share in bringing about this result.

In the United States, things are no better, and in speaking of non-religious schools, I am reminded of a professional visit I paid

some time ago to one of the Northern States of the Union. It was one of the most distinguished academies in the State. I had a long conversation with the Principal, and I put a question or two to him and got answers which amazed me. I asked as to the condition of the pupils; he thought I referred to the moral condition, which I had not intended and being seated near me he grasped me by the arm and said: "Doctor, the place is

A HOT BED OF VICE

and God help me, I don't know how to remedy it. I have done all that I can, but evidently there is something which I cannot reach and cannot control, and how it is to be remedied I do not know."

"Well, what is your system of instruction?"

"We teach physiology and all the otherologies, but nothing of theology; God is kept in the background, and we have very apt scholars."

This is what the good conscientious Episcopalian clergyman said to me and he said it with great emotion: "My wife, he continued, has tried all she can and without avail." I asked how it was to be remedied and he said; "It is only in one way, but it is useless for me to speak of it. God, the Saviour, must be brought back to the schools, from which He has been banished, and, I hope, ere it is too late."

We, loyal British subjects, are accustomed to look to Great Britain (and I hope the time will never come when we will cease to look in that direction) for example, I hope we will have the manliness to follow that example. There we find able, serious, thoughtful men moving in the direction of religious schools at the present time. Gladstone and Salisbury Balfour and Morley—all the great leaders in thought—and the two great Christian Churches of the realm—all agreeing in the absolute necessity of religious education for the people.

Let us not blame the Pastors when they try to keep out of the country a system of education which has been disastrous in France. Depriving a child of the knowledge of Divine things when the parent desires that knowledge to be imparted is an injustice, and to whom?

IT IS AN INJUSTICE TO GOD;

it is an injustice to parents; it is an injustice to the children; it is an injustice to civil society. I am told that separate schools are

not efficient in the Province of Quebec, and we are asked not to give them such schools in Manitoba as those in Quebec. They who make that statement are profoundly ignorant of what obtains in Quebec. I dare say I should surprise some,—not many, because we are too well informed not to admit the correctness of what I state—that in no part of the Dominion of Canada is education at a higher standard; and in no part of Canada are there more educated people in proportion to the population than in Quebec. Look at the proceedings of the Royal Society, and one will find more literateurs in the city of Quebec alone than in any other city in the Dominion. There are too many educated men there. The professions are overstocked all over the Province. One gets education in Quebec at a less figure than in any of the other Provinces of the Dominion. One may receive board and education for 21 pounds or \$84 a year, and if that could not be given, for \$70 or \$50; in some cases colleges take pupils for nothing. If they see a young man who promises well they will endeavor to fit him for a position and will educate him. Some of our most brilliant lawyers; some of our most learned physicians and many zealous priests, have had their classical education for nothing. If one goes into Montreal he may, at any time, hear French gentlemen speaking most classic English. We have distinguished men going from our Province, to plead cases in Great Britain. We have never, since the time of Vallieres, had his equal. He was a French-Canadian, yet he spoke English when in London better, it was remarked, than any of the lawyers he contended against. I do not know whether, if one went to the English speaking provinces of the Dominion, one could find quite so many who are able to speak French, and yet the French Canadians are as familiar with Latin and Greek as we, the English-speaking are, so that

WE ARE NOT LOSING IN QUEBEC.

I say the schools which can produce these results in Quebec are good and worthy schools, and it would not be prejudicial to the interests of any portion of the Dominion were they to be copied. The people in Manitoba had their schools modelled after those in Quebec and enjoyed them for nearly eighty years without disturbance; and now, having been ruthlessly deprived of them, there will

never be peace and harmony until they are restored. But you may ask *how*, after what has taken place at the hustings in the Province of Quebec? Again, I say with the leader of the Opposition in this honorable house, what difference does it make? But let me give a word of explanation with regard to the action of the people of Quebec, and I do not think you will have the harsh feelings against them you otherwise might have. The question of the Manitoba schools hung fire so long that people began to be uneasy, and to doubt the earnestness, and indeed the honesty, of the leaders. And then I will say here—I am sorry to be obliged to say it—something which occurred at Ottawa in the month of January, 1896, had much to do with disturbing the people's thoughts, and at political meetings they were told: "To whom are you to entrust your interests? To men not of our race nor of our religion," and they would quote speeches of the hon. member for Simcoe, for instance, and of the former Controller of Customs and others, who evince in their speeches no love for us, nor for our Province, nor for our people, and would say, "are you safer with these men than with us, the men of your own religion; your own flesh and blood; your own compatriots," etc., etc. But let me tell you there is an awakening,

A VERY SERIOUS AWAKENING,

I think, in the Province of Quebec, and before long, if it has an opportunity, it will show that it is not less intelligent and not less sympathetic than it should be. I go a good deal through the country, and while I never speak on politics while on professional duty, and rarely, indeed, do I discuss them at any time, I hear men who worked for the present Government thinking that, because promises were made, and made solemnly that the new aspirant to power would give more than his opponents would give—when, I say, I find such men now uttering condemnations of the settlement, and saying: "Ils ont fait bien de belles promesses, mais ils n'ont pas gardé leurs promesses." I am convinced that if an election were to take place in the Province of Quebec to-morrow, except in certain districts where party spirit is above everything else and crushes out conscience and the duties and dictates of the conscience; then I say that it would be found there has been a most material change in public feeling. But we

are asked what is the use of all this religion? I hear at all hours of the day that *science* is the thing to teach. I would ask any hon. gentleman in this room what branch of science he would wish his child to learn and to pin his faith to? That question would puzzle the parent as much as it would puzzle the child. I am tired of those sciences which are as changeful as the figures in the kaleidoscope—nothing stable—nothing permanent, but hold and bald assertion. I have found that what was laid down as fundamental principles years ago is put aside as nothing to-day. I find in certain departments of science that there have been complete changes three or four times in the course of as many decades. Take the very structure of the earth we inhabit, and take ourselves who inhabit it. Those of us who have put aside revealed religion and authority, have taken to evolution, if to anything positive, but that is not sufficient now.

EVOLUTION IS NOT THE LAST VAGARY

of the German mind. Here is something newer: that the whole universe is one ethereal elastic mass, and in that there are countless particles of precise form which are impenetrable, and which have in addition the property of *inertia* and these are supposed to conglomerate together and arrange themselves in such wise as to form man, with all his courage and manliness; woman with her gentleness and beauty; the tiger with all its ferocity; the mollusk with all its sliminess etc., and all from this combination or selection of spherical particles of precise size inhabiting and suspended in the elastic fluid. And such is creation—and in such wise are we created. A creation so independent of an Almighty is at the will and wickedness of all—and the relative and material increase of a people of its opposite gives evidences of where these views receive the more general acceptance. Certainly not in French Canada.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald, (B.C.)—Is that what they make governments of?

Sir William Hingston—I do not know much of the making of governments—but that is the way the scientists make the men that make the governments. While on my visit to one of the northern States to which I have alluded, and speaking to my good

college friend, the Episcopalian minister, I saw some French books for the use of the students. This was a school from which religion was excluded, and where no religion prevails in a school something more markedly negative of good is sure to enter. The first book was *Diderot in French*, another was *Voltaire* and a third *Jacques Rousseau*. Then there was another book, *Balzac*. None of the others were spicy enough, and *Balzac* was introduced. Were you, Hon. gentlemen, to send your sons to an academy of learning like that, and were they to learn French, they would be sent to a French master and he would put such soul destroying books into their hands, and when they came back to your firesides would they honor you as they should honor their parents? If you send your son there

WOULD HE BE A BETTER BOY

when he returned than he was when he left his mother's care, and where he had learned at her knee the only true consoling and imperishable truths he had ever learned? It is surely far better to deprive children of the ability to acquire that kind of knowledge than to deprive them of the ability to acquire religious instruction. In the Province of Quebec what have we? We have a Protestant board of education and a Catholic board of education, and yet another board over-riding all. This supervising board interferes only when called upon by the Catholic board on the one side, or the Protestant one on the other. How often do you suppose they the superior authorities meet? I do not know that they meet once in twenty years. Things have gone on so smoothly; the Catholics attending to their affairs, and the Protestants to theirs, that the general board is not called upon. And such men as Sir William Dawson, the Rev. Dr. Shaw, Professor Robins, and hosts of other distinguished men whom I could name, have again and again borne testimony to the liberal Christian spirit with which the minority is treated, and such is the condition of things I hope we will have some day in Manitoba and throughout this country of ours when the proposed "settlement" will have been numbered with the things which were not to be, and the statute book will contain no record of broken faith

OUR SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

CAESAR, after due deliberation, crossed the Rubicon and became master of Rome, without any extraordinary military display. Many superficial writers of our day and country, cross the boundary river between patent truth and palpable falsehood, to the sound of rounded phrases and polished sentences, which if used in the defence of a just cause would discourse sweet music to the intelligent ear; employed as they are in the arsenal of deceit, they emit a hollow, meaningless discord. These exotic representatives of modern journalism wish to reach the Eternal City by forced marches, and make the spiritual Rome "howl."

This sphinx-like ambition supplies an overdose of adulterated lubrication to the intellectual machinery, which, under the unreliable guidance of a diseased and distorted imagination, produces a really ridiculous, little monster to be let loose and do its pigmy worst, upon the Separate School system of Ontario. The designers and builders of this harmless, ink-gatling, charge it with nonsensical impudence; tamp it with unchristian hatred; fire it with narrow-minded bigotry; quietly fold their arms and confidently expect to see every Separate School in the province crumble into ruins, from the effect of this waste-paper cannonade. The smoke rolls off; the Separate Schools still proudly rear their unbattered buttresses upon an impregnable rock; the poor, beguiled shooters find that they have been deluded by the uncertain, deceiving light of the *ignis fatuus* into discharging their muskets in the air. The cracked trumpets and ancient drums have not caused the walls of the Separate Schools to fall down; the toy-pistols, paper lances and wooden cannon of the ungallant raiders have not struck terror into the hearts of the Separate School supporters.

Some might think that if a doctor were to feel our pulse he would order us off to a Public School for our health, as a change of air would be good for our constitution. We wish it to be understood clearly and unmistakably, that we have no desire to make any attack upon the Public Schools of this Province. We state boldly and unequivocally that we have never sat for five minutes before a Separate School teacher, that we have never for five seconds occupied a desk in a Separate School room.

Circumstances over which we had no control, decreed that we should be deprived of this inestimable privilege. We have ever been and shall ever be duly grateful for the intellectual training received in the Public School. Gratitude, however, does not require us to observe a cowardly, guilty silence, when men who should and would know better, if justice and impartiality formed part of their curriculum, sit down in their dingy, bigotry-charged offices and grind forth excessively prejudiced editorials to prove that the Separate Schools of Ontario are a glaring fraud, a miserable failure and a disgraceful blot upon the fair escutcheon of our educational system. Not satisfied with this terrible condemnation, these know-all-about-it critics must needs add injury to insult; and in cold blood, proclaim it abroad from the dazzling heights of their rickety sanctum stools, that the Catholics of Ontario, staggering beneath the weight of taxes imposed upon them to support their schools, take advantage of every

opportunity to cast off this cumbersome burden and return to the sweet, light yoke of the Public Schools.

Without desiring to enter into any controversy with those, who, enamored with a system of secular, public education, defend it with a zeal and a determination worthy of a better cause; we must say that Catholics, firmly persuaded that the child's heart should be educated, its passions purified by the knowledge and love of its Creator and Redeemer, stand unflinchingly and logically in favor of a religious training in the schoolroom. The child has an intellect, an imagination and a heart; train one to the neglect of the others and we have a dwarf—a monster in nature. In the Catholic school the different powers of the student, intellect, soul and sense, are at work, no one in opposition to the other or in violation of the laws of the moral being.

After this brief and feeble exposition of the Catholic's standpoint on matters educational, we withdraw from the arena of polemics and take up, one by one, the principal indictments against our Separate Schools. A mere cursory glance over this numerically formidable category of impeachments, periodically served up for the delectation of the faithful by a certain *clique* of our pressmen and anniversary orators, will inform us that the decoction has not been brewed from actual observation of facts of our day; the prescription has been written by one who has spent his days and nights poring over the fables recorded in certain libels on history, which if a person wishes to believe, he must use spectacles of a peculiar color. It is the old "Comedy of Errors" placed on the boards once more; the actors are the same, the scene is the same as in days of yore; the stage paraphernalia alone is in modern style. These gentlemen have a thesis to prove and are blessed with a hobby; everything, even the rustling of the hedges in the soft evening breeze, furnishes arguments in their favor. The fundamental principle of Descartes' system of philosophy is: "I think, therefore I am;" if our opponents' actions do not belie them, they are disciples of this great Frenchman, for they say: "We think the Separate Schools of Ontario are a hideous farce, therefore they are a hollow mockery."

Far be it from us to use any stock-in-trade arguments of peddling mountebanks; we despise the oft-exploded vagaries of certain so-called historians, whose sole object was to vilify the truth; we shall consult a very modern, up-to-date record, a modest volume bearing on its title page the significant legend: "Report, Minister of Education, Province of Ontario, (Canada), 1896." By that report, we stand or fall. Could the misguided maligners of Separate Schools be persuaded to spend a fractional part of an hour in the perusal of this excellent book, they would not rush blindly into print and we would be spared the disagreeable duty of inflicting ourselves upon the public. But, no! They must have their little say, regardless of outraged justice and discarded truth. They make broad, general, sweeping statements unsupported by even a lone quotation from statistical tables; cold figures would put a damper upon their inflammable imaginations. We are not patrons of such nonsensical logic, which, diluted with the wildest, grossest falsehoods, flimsy clap-trap reasoning, does not deserve serious consideration and is not suited to the pen of a man, who has any pretension to accuracy and fair play; we do not tear statistics and shall answer every charge by excerpts from the official report of the Ontario government. These quotations will most assuredly trace the precise line that separates falsehood from its kindred truth.

The first and perhaps most important charge claims, that Catholics are lukewarm in their support of separate schools and do not take advantage of them. It is openly declared that the separate schools are in a state of

stagnation, that it is only a question of a few years until they will die a natural death, due to sundry internal disorders.

If we desired to be apologetic we might recall the terrible battle that Catholics were called upon to fight for the very existence of their schools, during the early days after the enactment of the Separate School law. We might name certain carpet-bag politicians who strained every nerve to cripple separate schools and make them unworkable. Let us consult the Report of the Minister of Education on the matter; we append a statement of the progress and development of Separate Schools in Ontario since 1867. By its side will be found the number of public school students from '87 to '95.

| SEPARATE SCHOOLS. | | | | PUBLIC SCHOOLS. | |
|-------------------|-----------------|---------|----------|-----------------|----------|
| Year. | No. of Schools. | Pupils. | Teachers | Year. | Pupils. |
| 1867. | 161. | 18,924. | 120. | | |
| 1872. | 171. | 21,406. | 254. | | |
| 1877. | 185. | 24,952. | 334. | | |
| 1882. | 190. | 26,148. | 390. | | |
| 1887. | 229. | 30,373. | 491. | 1887. | 493,212. |
| 1892. | 312. | 37,466. | 662. | 1892. | 485,670. |
| 1893. | 313. | 38,067. | 684. | 1893. | 481,068. |
| 1894. | 328. | 39,762. | 715. | 1894. | 483,203. |
| 1895. | 344. | 39,773. | 755. | 1895. | 484,551. |

Comment is superfluous. What a glorious stagnation! Between '67 and '95, the number of Separate Schools has been more than doubled. This is undoubtedly an enormous advance, yet the number of recognized Separate Schools is not as large as it should be. In our own limited personal experience we know of one parish, not 1,000 miles from Ottawa city, in which there are four schools to all intents and purposes Separate Schools; in the eyes of the law, however, they are Public Schools. Practically speaking the matter is of no importance since all the teachers and pupils are Catholic. At the present time, when Catholics are taunted with being indifferent to Separate Schools, it is a great mistake that these have not been registered as such. Others, we are sure, could give similar instances of neglect in various parts of Ontario. * Separate School teachers, they say, are few and far between; still the number has been almost quadrupled since '67 and doubled since '87. Separate School students, it is claimed, are on the decrease; the year '95 reports more than twice as many pupils as '67.

Thus between 1887 and 1893 the Separate Schools gained 8,000 students. During the same period the Public Schools have lost 12,000, in spite of the fact, that the system has been dosed and doctored with a tonic of 400 voters, a sedative of 1,500 children or rather babies under 5 and an appetizer of a large number of students, who remain for the Public School leaving examination, which admits them into the second year of the High School course. Some say that the Separate School gain is the Public School loss. Such a reply is loaded both ways. It proves the falsity of the statement, that the Catholics are becoming lukewarm towards their own schools, since they are, if we might use

* Here are a few schools not registered as Separate Schools, yet, which to all intents and purposes are such: S. S. No. 7, Wolfe Island; 4 schools in Hunlley; 1 in Gloucester; 1 at Brewer's Mills; 1 at Goulbourn; 1 at Alfred; 1 at Mount St. Patrick; and 1 at Gower Point. [ED. OWL.]

a vulgar phrase "on the run" from the Public Schools. Then again, it would require a first-class professor of Calculus to differentiate a Separate School gain of 8,000 into a Public School loss of 12,000; more especially when we remember that this number must be increased by the influx and reflux of babies, voters and Public School leaving graduates, referred to in the previous paragraph. The true solution of the Public School loss, as evidenced by the Government report, consists in the alarming annual decrease of children in the first and second books. He who runs may read.

Following the line of argument laid down by the opponents of Separate Schools, our only rational conclusion is that the Protestant people of Ontario do not wish to patronize the Public Schools. As a matter of fact, we know from a reliable authority, that in at least one city of Ontario, Protestant children have left and are leaving the Public to attend the Separate Schools. These facts and figures teach certain gentlemen a wholesome lesson; they ought to pluck the weeds out of their own gardens and be possessed of sufficient christian charity not to throw them over the fence into their neighbors' well-trimmed plots. It would certainly be idiotic on our part, to allow the cast-off noxious plants to ferment in our gardens, teeming with rare roses sweet of odor and goodly to behold. We might expatiate at greater length upon the unstable condition of the Public Schools; it is ungentlemanly to hit a man a hard knock, after he has received a bad fall, and is tottering about in desperation to regain his lost equilibrium.

Others maintain, that at least 50 per cent of the Catholic pupils attend the Public Schools. Doubtless many Catholics are forced to support Public where it is impossible to establish Separate Schools. Why cast this reproach in their teeth? Is it a crime that Catholics are not sufficiently numerous in certain districts? We defy any man to prove from statistics, that 50 per cent of the Catholic children are Public School students; official reports are simply silent on the matter. If it were true, the number of Catholic School children would be abnormal. It is an unblushing exaggeration; a mere bogus silken wool, all wool and a yard wide, the product of an exuberant imagination.

The next wail of woe raised by meddling busybodies, convicts the Separate Schools of inefficiency and extravagance. The quintessence of business maxims is: Buy at the market in which can be purchased *the best goods for the least money*. The almighty dollar is an important factor in modern life; we give precedence to the money side of the question. Let the figures tell the tale.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

| |
|----------------------|
| Cost per pupil. |
| In Counties, \$6.04. |
| In Cities, 8.74. |
| In Towns, 7.58. |
| Average Cost, 7.46. |

PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

| |
|-----------------------|
| Cost per pupil. |
| In Counties, \$ 7.59. |
| In Cities, 14.81. |
| In Towns, 8.28. |
| Average Cost, 8.96. |

SALARY OF TEACHERS.

Separate Schools:

Public Schools.

| | Male | Female | | Male | Female |
|--------------|-------|--------|--------------|-------|--------|
| In Counties, | \$315 | \$218 | In Counties, | \$365 | \$258 |
| In Cities, | 384 | 185 | In Cities, | 864 | 419 |
| In Towns, | 493 | 230 | In Towns, | 642 | 301 |
| Average | 390 | 211 | Average | 623 | 326 |

ECONOMY.

Decrease in expenditure in Separate Schools during '95, was \$40,652.06. Decrease in expenditure in the Public Schools for the same year was \$10,287.34. If the same scale of economy had been practiced in the management of the Public Schools, their relative decrease in expenditure should have been a round \$671,000.

Separate School supporters evidently have the best of the bargain from a pecuniary standpoint. Do we find that the goods delivered are up to the standard? In our humble opinion, the efficiency of a school is proved by the regular attendance of its pupils, a sufficient staff of competent teachers and the success of its students at the departmental examinations. If we were composing a text book on Geometry we would throw our next query into the form of a postulate; Let these standards be applied to the Separate and Public Schools. We quote throughout this article the Government report for 1895, the latest in which complete details are given.

Average attendance of registered students. In the Separate Schools it was 62 per cent. net gain 3 per cent. In the Public Schools it was 56 per cent. net gain 0 per cent. If we take the highest average attendance by divisions, we have the following results.

| Separate Schools. | Public Schools. |
|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| In Counties, 74 per cent. | In Counties, 62 per cent. |
| In Cities, 80 per cent. | In Cities, 79 per cent. |
| In Towns, 84 per cent. | In Towns, 75 per cent. |

Neither the Separate nor the Public Schools have a sufficient number of teachers; the Separate Schools, however, are the more venial sinners in this respect. Every teacher in the Public School has an average of 59 registered students; in the Separate Schools the average is 52.

The only standard by which we can judge the proficiency of a teacher, is the success of his pupils at the various provincial examinations. The cause is the competency of the teacher; the effect, the success of the student. We quote from the official record, for the Entrance examinations into High Schools and Collegiate Institutes for the year 1895.

The average of successful students throughout the Province, including Separate and Public Schools, was 59 per cent. In the Western Division of the Separate Schools the successful percentage was 62; in the Eastern Division it was 72. Yet, some will insist in claiming, that the Separate Schools are a nuisance; they are undoubtedly a bugbear to those who wish to prove that nothing good can come out of a Catholic school.

In the Public School leaving examination, the average of successful candidates for the Province was 51 per cent. In the Western Division of the Separate Schools, the percentage was 50; in the Eastern Division it was 73. The general average for the Separate Schools was, in round numbers, 62 per cent. or 11 per cent above that of the Province. In addition to this, Mattawa Separate School had successful candidates at all the various district examinations for teachers. Cornwall Separate School had one pupil, who succeeded in obtaining a Provincial Third Class Teacher's Certificate. These schools are therefore performing High School work. In 1896, the Collegiate Institute of Lindsay sent up ten candidates for first-class, provincial certificates. Only three, and these former pupils of the Separate School, were successful.

In the Art Schools and Departmental Drawing Examinations for Separate, Public and High Schools and Ladies' Colleges, Advanced Course, 188 proficiency certificates were granted in the the Province; of these 114 were captured

by Catholic Institutions. Extra Subjects, total number of certificates granted for all schools.

| | Drawing from life. | Painting from life. | Painting oil colors. | Painting water colors. | China painting | Pastel painting | Pen and Ink design. | Indus- trial design. | Total. |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|--------|
| Catholic Institutions | 1 | 1 | 13 | 23 | 14 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 55 |
| Other Institutions | 0 | 0 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 29 |

We roll up our brief ; our defence is closed. The presentation has been sadly deficient; our case rests upon the immutable basis of truth and justice. The opposing counsel cannot dispute the evidence adduced, they cannot cast an insinuating aspersion upon the fair name of our witnesses. We hope that we have persuaded the opponents of Separate Schools to think twice, ere they pronounce the system a failure; we are egotistical enough to believe, that we have convinced Catholics, that their schools are just as good as, if not superior to, the much lauded Public Schools.

ALBERT NEWMAN, '93

Ah, such is Hope ! as changeful and as fair !
 Now dimly peering on the wistful sight,
 Now hid behind the dragon-wing'd Despair :
 But soon emerging in her radiant might
 She, o'er the sorrow-clouded breast of Care,
 Sails like a meteor, kindling in its flight.

COLERIDGE.

BLUE BLOSSOMS.

GENTLE priest, reserved, yet ever kind,
 Holding a bunch of blossoms blue and sweet,
 For flowers he loved, with meditative mind
 Walking alone, a small child chanced to meet,
 Who eyed the flowers with wistful, longing look,
 And quickly in his warm clasp were they placed
 With gracious smile and words, then his way took
 The priest, but feeling lonely for that book
 In whose fair pages he had lately traced
 Lessons of philosophy writ in light
 By finger of omnipotence. The child
 Abashed, yet happy, treasured day and night
 The flowers, but more, remembrance of the mild
 And reverend donor. Years, long years have sped
 Like to a lily white cut in its bloom,
 The priest long since was numbered with the dead;
 Stranger, but reverent hands closed in his tomb,
 And quickly, too, the void he left was filled.
 The child is now a man, grey-haired and chilled
 By frosts of coming age, but in his heart
 There is a nook where in perpetual Spring
 And youth, a tender memory keeps apart;
 A sacred vision of a priest—a king,
 Grace-crowned, bestowing royal gifts; the gold
 Of Christ-like kindness in a jewelled vase
 Of self-denial. Memory hath grown cold
 Of thee, O Ebrais, save in one soul's space.
 There thou art shrined, perpetual orison
 Commemorating thee at heaven's high throne.

ETHAN HART MANNING

The Owl.

PUBLISHED BY

The Students of the University of Ottawa.

TERMS: One dollar a year in advance. Single copies, 15 cents. Advertising rates on application.

THE OWL is the journal of the students of the University of Ottawa. Its object is to aid the students in their literary development, to chronicle their doings in and out of class, and to unite more closely the students of the past and present to their Alma Mater.

BOARD OF EDITORS:

J. J. QUILTY, '97.

J. RYAN, '97.

E. P. GLEESON, '98.

J. T. HANLEY, '98.

R. D. McDONALD, '98.

W. P. Egleson, '99.

L. E. O. PAYMENT, '99.

M. A. FOLEY, '00.

P. J. GALVIN, '00.

Business Managers: { T. RYAN, '99.
J. A. MEEHAN, '00.

Address all letters to "THE OWL," OTTAWA UNIVERSITY, OTTAWA, ONT.

Vol. X. MAY, 1897. No. 9.

REMARKS.

We are pleased to place before the readers of the "OWL," one of Rev. Father Gervais' musical compositions, the "Cecilian March." This march was written originally for the College band and has often delighted our College audiences. Recently Rev. Father Gervais reduced the March for the piano; it has necessarily lost by the process, but is still a beautiful piece of music.

The present issue of the "OWL" has quite insensibly taken on a decidedly educational cast. No harm will thereby be done. If there is one

question which, more than another, needs to be clearly and fully treated, both in its unchanging principles and its varying results, it is that of education. For Catholics, the matter is of supreme interest and importance. He was not far from the true line of action who said, that if he were called upon to sacrifice either the parish church or the parish school, he would retain the latter and let the former go.

Read the article, "Our Separate Schools." It is based on facts and figures extracted from the report of Minister of Education for 1896, and it teaches a much-needed lesson to those bilious Catholics—for there are such—who can see nothing good in their own schools, and who drop into an ecstasy of superstitious reverence before the public schools—of which they know nothing.

The privileges of poetry will, perhaps, protect Rudyard Kipling from the just wrath of the Canadian people against the latest title that has been forged for their country. "Our Lady of the Snows" may be poetic, but it is not true when applied to Canada. It is a poor return for the preferential clause of the new Canadian tariff, by which we discriminate against other nations in favor of Great Britain.

Give more than a cursory glance at the two noble speeches we print in this number of the "OWL." Hon. John Costigan and Sir Wm. Hingston have raised the discussion on the education question high above political exigencies and personal interests. They have made it a matter of conscience, of

principle and of justice. Let us thank God that by their example, these two staunch Irish Catholic representatives have shown that not all the men of Israel are ready to bow the knee to Baal.

The *Catholic Register* has got His Anglican Lordship, Bishop Sullivan of Toronto into a very uncomfortable corner. Or rather His Lordship has deliberately, blindly, recklessly and very successfully cornered himself. In one of his Lenten sermons, Bishop Sullivan made the following assertion: "Some people think a lie permissible under certain conditions. In a book used in universities of the Roman Communion this view is taken." His Lordship was at once challenged for proof by the *Catholic Register*. In reply he gave as his authority the theologian, Dr. Peter Dens. The *Register* now shows conclusively that Dr. Dens teaches no such doctrine, and moreover that his work is not used in universities of the Roman Communion.

Bishop Sullivan made a very silly and imprudent, as well as false, charge. He should have reflected on the fate his Anglican brother, Canon Kingsley, met some fifty years ago for a similar slanderous statement. Cardinal Newman turned the Canon into the most delapidated looking toy pistol that ever graced the heel-end of a national holiday.

We are anxiously awaiting Bishop Sullivan's explanation, unless, indeed, he wishes to prove it true that there is at least one person in Toronto who thinks "a lie permissible under certain conditions." Come now, Bishop, what are you going to do in the matter?

ONE VIEW OF IT.

On the 4th of last March, the Hon. G. W. Ross, Minister of Education for Ontario, delivered a speech in defence of the policy of the Education Department of which he is the official head. There are many points in the speech that are worthy of every commendation; there are, also, a hundred and one things to which objection might rightly be taken. Let us note but one of the Minister's arguments. "The growth of Public Libraries," he says, "is an important feature of the work of the last fourteen years, and the extent to which libraries have been used by the people of Ontario is a *very gratifying* sign of increased intellectual activity as a result of their advanced education." Perhaps so. Let us see. In the year 1896, the total number of volumes issued was 1,917,365; of this total, 1,318,857 volumes were either "Fiction" or "Tales and Essays." "Religious Literature" had the magnificent showing of 36,082 volumes. Is this a "*very gratifying* sign of increased intellectual activity" and "advanced education"? Well, perhaps so. Everything depends on one's point of view.

THE QUEBEC SCHOOLS.

If there is an institution in Canada that has few outspoken friends and numerous loud-mouthed enemies, it is the Quebec Schools. Hatred is more active and energetic than love, and so the Catholic schools of the backward and benighted sister Province are overwhelmed with abuse, ridicule, calumny and misrepresentation. As a matter of fact those schools are just as worthy of praise and just as deserving of blame as are similar establishments

in other parts of the Dominion—no more, no less. But who are those enemies of the Quebec Schools? They may be roughly categorized into two main classes. Protestant enemies, who are either invincibly ignorant, or blindly bigoted, or unwisely national, or deplorably narrow-minded, or wilfully malicious. And Catholic enemies—and these are either irresponsible cranks, or disappointed soreheads, or anti-French fanatics, or interested egotists, or self-appointed reformers, or deliberate trouble-makers. Happily the Catholic crowd is more noisy than numerous. But for both crowds, be they large or small, the following letter from "The Khan," the able editor of the Dundas *Banner*, and one of the keenest observers in Canada, will be gall and wormwood. For that reason, among others, the OWL gives it editorial space. It appeared first in the Toronto *World* and reads as below:—

GOING BACKWARD.

"We have scriptural authority that man shall not live on bread alone. That's sensible. Let us apply it indirectly to our schools. The Public schools of Ontario are frequently compared to the schools, religious or otherwise of Quebec, and always to the disadvantage of the latter. We are all given to bragging in a loud tone of voice that our children learn more, study more, get loaded up with useful information more, are "smarter," etc., than the offspring of the seventeenth century Quebec.

Let's see now: There is nothing in which the children of Quebec, especially those taught by the Sisters, are head and shoulders over our hopefuls, and that will be made plain as you read on, my Christian friend.

I was down in Quebec not long ago, and was out in the country trying to find the residence of an old friend of mine. On the road I met a little lad on his way to school. As he passed me he lifted his cap and his face lit up with a winsome smile as he bade

me, "Bonjour, M'sieu!" I took heart of grace and hailed him:

"Can you tell me where Col. Boucher lives, my little man?"

"Pardonnez-moi," he said, frankly, with another lift of the cap. "I spik not the English; how you call heem—with 'fluence, I go wis you. I show you where le lif."

I protested that he would be late for school and might be punished.

"Ah, no!—non, no!" gesticulating eloquently with his little brown hand. "Non—no! Voila! Ze good Sisters they will be charm—zay will be eclazees ven zay learn zat I haf bin os som service to an estranger!"

He then conducted me to the top of a hill, pointed out the house, and left me with a bow that would do justice to a duke of blood royal.

A week later I am in an Ontario village and meet a 'smart' looking youth in the road.

"Could you kindly inform me where Mr. John Smith lives."

"Wha-a-a-t?"

"Where Mr. Smith lives?" I repeated.

"Which Smith? Old Smith, er big Smith, er fatty Smith, er gangrene Smith, er ole Sis Smith—she's the grey mare. What you want with him ennyhow?"

I walked on in disgust.

Passing an Ontario schoolhouse in the summer you are liable to be stoned, in the winter snowballed, and you will be guyed and yelled at at all seasons, and if you visit the school they will never take their eyes off you in a curious stare while you remain. The boys are never taught to show a chivalrous and high-bred respect for the girls, and the art of lifting the hat to a lady, a clergyman or an oid person, is altogether lost; in fact, some of them have to be told to take their hats off in church.

Oh, yes, we teach the children a lot of stuff, and they get to be very smart, and it is not uncommon to have them take out certificates and diplomas before they have shed their milk teeth, but if we would throw some of the text-books out of the window and teach the girls the old fashioned curtsy and how to cross a room as if they were not going over plowed land, and teach our boys to lift their hats and treat their elders with respect, it would be better for us and them.

The Khan.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

A BILL is to be introduced into the French Chamber of Deputies for the safe guarding of public morality. The bill seeks to prohibit, the singing of vile songs in public halls, the publication of obscene literature and the distribution of indecent pictures. This certainly is a step in the right direction, yet had the Government of France been more Christian, fewer of these abominable evils would have been fostered in that country.

FROM Hoffman's Directory we take the following statement regarding the state of the Church in Mexico. There are six archdioceses, fifty-two dioceses and one Vicariate-Apostolic in that Republic. In the archdiocese of Oaxaca there are 980 churches with a Catholic population of 900,000. In nearly every parish there are Catholic schools.

If the Boers of South Africa ever had the sympathy of people on this side of the Atlantic, they certainly lost a great measure of it by one of the recent acts of President Kruger's government. Oom Kruger to show what an ideal republic was the Transvaal, suppressed a newspaper that had the courage to criticise some of the acts of his administration, If Kruger had been a Catholic and guilty of such an act he would have been denounced throughout the world as an intolerant bigot.

A WRITER in the *Catholic World* recalls how one of the American wise men,—“rest his bones, he's dead”—gave the following reply to the question, “Why do you not believe the Divinity of Christ?” “Because the whole system of Roman Catholicism would follow.” Let us hope that he exclaimed before his death, *credo*.

HERE is a paragraph from an English Protestant newspaper which is worthy of reproduction: There was a singular scene at Westminster Abbey on Oct. 13th, last. For many years the Roman

Catholics, after a service in an adjacent church of their own, have made a pilgrimage to the tomb of Edward the Confessor in the Abbey, on his feast day. For the first time the day was observed by the Abbey authorities with choral celebration of Holy Communion in the morning and an address on the history and character of Edward the Confessor by the Bishop of Peterborough after evensong. His Lordship gave a masterly address on the subject, which was listened to with rapt attention. As the congregation came out there was a stream of incoming Roman Catholics anxious to reach the tomb, some carrying wreaths; and the double devotion to Edward the Confessor had an effect which anywhere else but in church would have been ludicrous.

In a pamphlet entitled “The Canadian Fund for the Commemoration of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee by founding The Victorian Order of Nurses in Canada,” we find the following glowing tribute to the work of our self-sacrificing Canadian nuns: There is no occasion to make more than a brief reference to the excellent work of the trained nurses now in Canada. They are veritable angels of mercy wherever they go. Among those whose acts of kindness are known of all men and women, are the members of Societies of Churches; and especially the Sisterhood of the Roman Catholic Church. The devotion, the self-sacrifice, the evident purity and goodness of these Sisters are a living benediction to the communities where they labor in all parts of Canada. Their lives are full of unselfish labour and love; and any life with that experience is saved from being poor.”

ALTHOUGH the Anglican hierarchy have attempted to reply to Leo's pronouncement against the validity of Anglican orders yet their rejoinder does not seem to satisfy even members of their own church. Archdeacon Taylor says of it: “In common with many, I have read the reply with pro-

found regret. With all due respect for the eminent prelates who have sent it forth, I cannot but regard it as altogether unsatisfactory and unworthy of the occasion. Far better to have left the bull unanswered altogether. Again he says with regard to the reply being directed to the Bishops of the Catholic Church: "I doubt if there is a single bishop in the world outside of the churches in England and Ireland, save, perhaps, one of the 'old Catholics,' who would agree with its statements or admit the validity of Anglican ordinations." The *Independent* says: "The reply of the archbishops by no means meets the criticism and the condemnation passed by the Pope on the validity of Anglican orders."

Mr. Bourke Corcoran to whom Leo XIII, granted an audience in March says of our Holy Father: I had seen the Pope before, but only in public functions. I had, therefore, never been brought so close to his person, nor made to feel from so near the magic of his presence. His frail body was as the shrine of an indwelling spirit nobler than itself, just as a lamp of alabaster, which owes its beauty and its worth to the flame it more than half conceals, the light transmitted through its scarce transparent walls. I treasure the personal part of the audience as a thing of tender recollection, but I was unspeakably impressed and startled, by the energy and strength with which the Pope spoke of the Christianizing of the peoples, of the purpose of the Papacy as a factor for the salvation of souls through the bettering of the world.

In one portion of his work, "Five Years in Madagascar," Col. Maude, a British army officer and a member of the Anglican church, says: "Were I to

single out any sect for especial praise," (in missionary work) "I should not hesitate to accord it to the Jesuit clergy—not on account of their tenets, with which I do not happen to agree, but because of their energy, and their marvellous self-denial and frugality. In my humble opinion, the intelligent and practical way in which they administer the affairs of their little colonies is to do exactly what is most wanted in Madagascar, and in the very best possible way.

OUR Toronto contemporary the *Evangelical Churchman*, Anglican organ, in a recent editorial agrees with the Pope in pronouncing Anglican orders invalid in the sense that a sacrificing priesthood is not created; and it cites, as additional proof of that verdict's correctness, the refusal of the Jansenist church of Holland, in 1894, to recognize Anglican orders, at the request of Bishop Wordsworth. The *Churchman* says, "the reason of that refusal, is identical with that more elaborately set forth in the papal bull. The Anglican bishops, they said, had rejected the power to sacrifice. Their church, therefore, was no true church, but only a congregation of laymen, without a bishop, priest or deacon." Here is our Toronto friend's own opinion of "High"-churchmen and their ministers' pretensions to be priests: "They are ready enough to repudiate Protestantism for themselves; but they cannot re-write history; they cannot remove the significant facts which constitute our church a Protestant church and our ordinal a Protestant and Scriptural ordination of pastors and ministers of the Word.... It lacks alike the Roman intention to make sacrificing priests, and the ritual form of so doing, which was expressly eliminated from it."

PRIORUM TEMPORUM FLORES.

San Francisco, Cal., is now the residence of several of our alumni. Among those engaged in ministering to the spiritual wants of the people of that city, we learn with pleasure of the Rev. James A. Grant, '90, who is stationed at St. Paul's Church. The two brothers, Revs. Bernard and Wm. D. McKinnon are also doing good work in similar positions. In the same city Dr. Jos. Masson, '89, like a good Christian is busy healing the sick. To all, the OWL extends its sincere good wishes.

...

We are glad to hear that Dr. Harry Wall monopolizes the estimation of the good people of Oregon, and contributes to the health of the same.

...

Mr. P. J. Cooney, ex, '98, is now a successful merchandise broker in Butte City, Montana.

...

Mr. Edward Beatty who attended here in '90 now enjoys a lucrative medical practice in Mallard, Iowa.

...

Among those who successfully passed the recent examinations in medicine we note with great satisfaction the names of Messrs. John A. Tierney, ex, '97, and A. Letellier, who is a commercial graduate of Ottawa University. The former passed with second-class honors at McGill, while the latter made a very creditable showing at Queen's. The OWL takes this first opportunity of congratulating the young doctors and of wishing them many years of success in the practice of the profession they have chosen.

ATHLETICS.

On Easter Monday the University Athletic Association held its annual meeting. There was a large attendance and considerable interest was manifested in the election of officers. Several candidates were nominated

for the positions of Secretary and Councillor. After keen and closely contested voting, the following gentlemen were chosen to look after the Association's interests, for the coming year:

President, T. Clancy; 1st Vice-President, E. Gleeson; 2nd Vice-President, J. Dulin; Treasurer, E. Bolger; Corresponding-Secretary, J. Hanley; Recording Secretary, T. Ryan; Councillors, J. Green and R. McDonald.

A well-deserved vote of thanks was tendered the retiring officers, Messrs. Foley and Quilty, who have always been devoted and attentive workers. If the new members of the committee prove themselves as dutiful and competent, they will certainly be deserving of congratulation.

The Treasurer's report for the past year, was listened to with much attention and satisfaction. With a large outlay for Football, and other expenses, his books showed a substantial surplus; in fact, greater than the Association has been able to begin work with for some time past. He also had the pleasure to record the success of the Football Team during last season, as well as the excellent showing made by our Hockey and Baseball teams, the latter of which won the Ottawa Valley League championship. The report was in every way satisfactory.

Unusual interest is being taken in Baseball this year. The creditable record made by our team last season in winning first place in its league, seems to have excited among the students a commendable desire and determination to duplicate that performance. Several clubs are already practising at pocketing sky-scrapers, and stopping grounders, so that when the first team is picked, we expect it will be a tricky ball that will get by them. The Athletic committee has appointed the following gentlemen to look after base-ball matters. Manager, T. Ryan. Committee, T. Morin, T. Clancy and J. Dulin.

It is not definitely known as yet in what series the students will play, but

it is probable a league will be formed comprising the College, Ottawa, National and Hull teams. Our players have successfully met these clubs before and it is but reasonable to expect that Hubert will draw as good a bow as his grandsire did at Hastings.

The Football teams are all selected for the Spring practices, and the games are about to begin. Nearly seventy players are now preparing to kick holes in the patient pigskin. Among them we notice many new men of promising appearance, who should have some chance of becoming successful future candidates for the champion team. It is a certainty that several of this year's club will be absent next fall. Their places will have to be filled, and the best available men will of course be called upon to step into the vacancies. Remember, practice has always been the secret of our players' success, whether individually or collectively. Be up then and doing. The prize is well worth the exertion. Here is a list of the teams :—

Capt. Prudhomme's; Berthelot, E. Gleeson, McNulty, McGuckin, Lawless, J. Moran, Côté, Boylan, Hanley, Hackett, Abbot, R. Murphy, Breen, Costello, J. Morin, Barclay and Valade.

Capt. Bolger's; Bélanger, F. McGee, Capbert, Murphy, Smith, Doyle, Prudhomme, Ryan, O'Reilly, Fallon, E. Barclay, Ergler, McDonald, Lafond, Hall and Chevrier.

Capt. Green's; O'Connell, Shea, J. Gleeson, Powers, Gobeil, St. Denis, F. Costello, Sénécal, Sullivan, Mackie, Conlon, Poupore, Ross, Meehan, Simms and Bélanger.

Capt. Dulin's; Fortin, Copping, M. Foley, Shanahan, F. Murphy, Fahey, Ryan, McGlade, Quilty, Smith, J. Sullivan, T. Clancy, Bawlf, Carroll, Angers, Philips and Pitre.

With such an array of players before us, there will hardly be any lack of material for the first team next fall. The schedule has been made out for the spring series, but as it will probably change with the weather, it would not be worth while to present it here.

The first of the Spring games took place on Wednesday April 30th, between Bolger's and Prudhomme's teams. Considering that this was the opening game of the season, and that the weather was very warm, the play was remarkably good. Prudhomme's team scored one point in the first half. In the second, they secured two tries and one goal, their opponents scoring two tries. Prudhomme accordingly won by 11 points to 8. Besides the two captains, those who most distinguished themselves were Smith, Doyle and McNulty. The last named is a young player but may surprise many before the series is finished.

The teams of Capts. Prudhomme and Green came together on Saturday last. There was ideal football weather, and the players showed better condition than might have been expected of them so early in the season. Heavy scrimmages were the order of the day, but at times there were some pretty exhibitions of open play. After a stubborn contest the referee decided the game a draw, the score being 11 to 11. Prudhomme's work as usual was very effective, while for the other side much praise was due to the beautiful scrimmaging of Ross, Gobeil and Shea.

Another game in the above series took place between the teams of Dulin and Bolger. It was generally understood among the students that Dulin's team would have a walk over; but they reckoned without their host; for Bolger had all the best of the play until the last five minutes, when a mistake on the part of one of his players, turned the tide of victory. Bolger played a brilliant game, and was well assisted by Doyle and Capbert. In Dulin's club, Clancy and Copping were the most conspicuous figures. At the end of the match the score stood 11 to 6 in favour of the latter team.

JUNIOR DEPARTMENT.

Capt. Groulx and Davie inaugurated the base-ball season on April 24th.

Dear young friends, please read baseball with the accent on the word *base*. After listening to the loquacity of the participants we have upon second consideration decided to write the word ball, *barol*, and you will now re-read it *base-barol*. The game was very interesting especially for those who had a few grains of common sense and took a nap in their rooms. The referee is popularly known as "Powerful Tom"; he certainly never won his laurels as umpire on the diamond. He allowed three men to take two bases on a pass ball. Probably this rule is enforced in sleepy Syracuse where they play with a soft stone and a chunk of a board. Bouchard was Capt. Davie's catcher, at least he was supposed to be. His catches were safe but were usually picked up on the rebound from the neighboring College wall. He was removed to second base which he held down in such grand style that he forgot to hold the ball. Poor Bouchard next figured at centre field and caught a half-dozen magnificent flies; they were these creeping, crawling things that are commonly ensnared in a sticky mass of tangle-foot. Richard would be a grand first-base man if he could be persuaded to invest in a barrel of mucilage and a poster's map to daub his hands. Ritchards at third-base was a sleeping beauty; he evidently thought he was playing goal for the hockey team. Capt. Groulx claimed that Clarke was put out on first because he had turned to the left; as far as we could see he turned neither to the right nor the left. He simply stood on his head and landed cat-like on his feet. Capt. Davie blocked a man on a run from first to second and would have put him out only the ball had in the meantime gone for a stroll. Pitcher O'Brien came to us with a recommendation a mile and a half long; his curve was as fast as a snail and as sinuous as the edge of a perfectly straight ruler. He pitched wonderful drops that invariably fell to the ground about 4 feet in front of the plate. The Groulx brothers

were a revelation; they *grew* in their own estimation, if not in that of ball enthusiasts. Capt. Davie caught a stunner of a high fly—in his cap; Jos. Clarke made the take-your-eye catch of the afternoon, when he stood on his head and captured the ball with his feet.

CHIT-CHAT CLUB.

A select few of our young wits have put their fair, curly heads together and formed a society, unique in the history of the happy hunting grounds of the junior department. Of course we know that strait-laced old gentlemen, with whitened or shining heads and a run resembling the shuffling of an ancient rooster, will sit in judgment upon them and pronounce their efforts "the folly" of the very young. If these quack grumblers could clear a seven-barred gate, they would not shout "sour grapes," but would rattle off nonsense with the best of our friends and think it glorious fun.

The end-man, Bert Murphy, had recently paid his first visit to Parliament Hill and was full of reveries of other days. We quote his own words: "As I sat upon the banks of Father, Ottawa and gazed far beyond the raging waters, methought, that I beheld the vanished Redman smoke the pipe of peace by the still waters of the quiet lake. Then again, the hatchet flashed in awful strife. I was brought to Mother Earth with an awful thud as Richard and Charlebois passed before me. My thoughts became vulgar and I saw the vast difference between these two young boys and the Chaudiere Falls." The rapt expression on Lebel's face was chased away by a look of despair by this sudden fall from the skies to mud and he angrily burst forth: "How the mischief can you draw a comparison between these children and the Falls?" Bert replied, "The swiftly-gliding waters take a *tumble* over the rock, but Richard, Charlebois & Co. never take a *tumble* that others want to kick the football."

All felt that Bert's answer had gone smooth and struck oil. Guy remarked that Bert's reference to the Hill reminded him that upon a late visit to the Canadian Senate, he was forcibly impressed with the striking resemblance which its atmosphere bore to O'Brien's pitching. "How's that?" chimed in a score of voices. Guy yawned, scratched his head, stood a little heavier upon Capt. Jack's toe and explained: "It is very s-l-e-e-p-y." Daly, whose eyes could scarcely be kept open and whose head bobbed up and down upon his breast, claimed that it was a crying shame for the College engineer to keep up such roaring fires these days, "Well, what might be the reason for that?" said Campeau. "Plain as the nose on your face. Under the new tariff, *smoke* is very dear." "As my new bike got bogged on Sussex street the other day," edged in Pothier, "It struck me at the time that I struck the mud, that this street and our Hand Ball Alley would make good running mates." "That's far fetched," said Burke. "No such thing," replied Pothier, "they both need new pavements." Lebel stood up in all the glory of his 2 ft. 6 in. and delivered a short impromptu declamation far superior to his "Cat and Dog" fad. "I suppose you will allow a little boy to speak his little speech. Evening shades have fallen fast and obscured the brilliancy of the noonday sun which always reminds me of Geo. Coalwater." "The Sun," exclaimed the end man, "You must be crazy. Of course Coalwater is a *son* but I do not think that he is a Sun nor even an imitation star in class or out of it." "Young man," said Lebel, "you have not cut your eye teeth yet or you would understand that Coalwater's head is as red as the brightest Sun that ever shone in the firmament." Even the best medicine is bad for the health. when administered too frequently; we bottle upon second dose until next month.

Chips from the old block. The living Collège colors: *Garnet* (Tackaberry) and (Archie) *Gray*.

"Signs of a smash-up in the Canadian Confederation. Quebec and Brt. Columbia are at daggers drawn." The above argument is knocked into a cocked hat by the close intimacy of Lebel and Daly.

We promised to reproduce snap shots of Bert and Guy, We withdraw that promise; we do not wish to throw our readers into a fit of hysterics and have to foot a large doctor's bill. We are a poor man as our creditors can testify.

Bert's progress in French, "We noo sums bon garsons;" Lebel's advancement in English: "Whoo ever sawed my wite nife an my red hanchef will give me to it.

ME GODFREY LABEL.

Mike's lament over Mavaut's folly.

"Oh where, oh where is my fast little bike.
Oh where, oh where can it be?
At home they say, 't was out all night
And great was Mavaut's glee."

The following held first places in their classes for the month of April:

First Grade (A).—I. P. Benoit, II. O. Vallée, III. A. Pinard.

First Grade (B).—I. J. Lamarche, II. H. St. Jacques, III. E. Benoit.

Second Grade.—I. C. Lafontaine, II. L. Poupore, III. J. Payment.

Third Grade.—I. Lapointe, II. R. Desrochers, III. O. Lemay.

Fourth Grade.—I. E. Foley, II. E. Belliveau, III. J. Abbott.

ULULATUS.

Rags! Bones!

You should see us play croquet at Smith's Falls.

Morarity's panorama presents a beautiful aspect

Prof.—What have you to say about balloons John?

Ab-t.—They have the most elevating influence of any of our modern inventions.

Through fear the fulfilment of certain pugnacious threats made against our treasured selves, we have resolved

that the name of Sir Hughhall appears no more in these colums for one month.

“Ma thinks there is only one Ray in the world.”

Cap. D. (consulting the oracle before game):—O Thou to whom uncovered are the things to come, reveal to me my tottering fate, for heavy lie my fears upon me?

Oracle :—

Ere scarce the hurly burly's done,
A doubtful game is played and won.
Be not outnumbered e'en by ore.

Scene, Corridor. Time, 0.15, a. m.
Ray. (hurriedly)—Say, Eli, let me take your exercise?

Eli blandly smiled as he produced a pair of dumb-bells.

Prof.—What superstitions were formerly entertained regarding comets?

McC.—The ancients believed that they were always followed by a tale... of sorrow.

Green's extravagance was rather unfavorably commented upon as he produced a jewel on the field.

Eis said the new comer thinks lacrosse balls *cost a low* figure.

Little Lap's most brilliant play was when he blocked Jimmy's swift kick... with his face.

A representation of one of the encounters of the Franco-Prussian war was witnessed when *anger* set in vibration all the strings of latent envy in Bismark

