

lature they will be, as a people, abandoned to their enemies. The Protestants of Quebec, forty-five years ago, used exactly the same language as is to-day heard in Ulster. Not all, for there were other voices, coming from those who professed to be superior to prejudice, who scouted the idea of the Papacy being hostile to British rights, declaring the alarm was raised by those who were conjuring a ghost of the past to defeat a wise and desirable legislative measure. They expressed entire confidence in the majority, asserting Protestants would be as secure in their rights under them as in the Union with Ontario. They laughed at the fears of their co-religionists as silly prejudices, asking them to clasp hands with their Catholic neighbours in working out a glorious destiny for Quebec and all Canada.

WHAT THE LEADERS OF THE MAJORITY SAID.

The tone of the leading men on the Catholic side differed. There were those who resented the fears expressed by the minority as insults, for it imputed to them personally and to their Church a persecuting spirit—a charge they would treat with contempt, as undeserving of reply. Others, and they were by far the more numerous, laboured good-humouredly to remove the suspicion entertained by the minority that they would be at a disadvantage when separated from Ontario. They were assured they could lay aside their fears, for they would be smothered with kindness. The chivalrous feeling excited by a weak minority trusting themselves confidently to the majority would ensure them the tenderest care. They were authoritatively assured the majority would not only be zealous in protecting them in the rights they were enjoying, but would see to it that they would never be wounded in their religious susceptibilities. For weeks and months there was a flood of gushing speeches about brotherly kindness, chivalrous regard for the

unprotected, respect for differences of belief, and praises of tolerance, forbearance, kindness. However, though they did not consider doing so necessary, they would waive the imputation on their sincerity by consenting to having embodied in the new Constitution guarantees to protect the rights of the minority, educational and otherwise. The Union with Ontario was broken, and Quebec became an independent province. That was nigh forty-five years ago. Let the Protestants of Ireland attend to the developments of those years, for in what has happened the Protestants of Quebec they may read what will be their own fate under a Parliament in College Green.

AN OBJECT-LESSON TO THE UNIONISTS.

Nations, like individuals, would often like to see into the future—know how proposed measures of magnitude would result when put into force. That is impossible. Nations as well as individuals have to learn by experience. When, however, a great change is contemplated neither are left without a guide—individuals have the experience of others, nations have the experience of the past. Home Rule is proposed for Ireland. That being so, is it not prudent to inquire into how Home Rule has worked elsewhere? Canada presents as near a parallel to the situation in Ireland as can be found. Is it prudent to ignore the lesson Quebec teaches? Will the statesmen of the United Kingdom take no cognisance of what has happened on the banks of the St. Lawrence? Will they make no inquiry as to how Home Rule has affected the Protestant farmers of the Province of Quebec before applying that system to the Protestant farmers of Ireland? Surely a trial of over forty years of Home Rule in a British dependency is long enough to decide the question. Is it advisable to force it on the third partner in the United Kingdom? Politicians, set in their pre-con-