

THE TRUE WITNESS

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
The Post Printing & Publishing Co.
AT THEIR OFFICES:
60 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada.

Subscription, per annum, \$1.50
ad strictly in advance \$1.00

TO ADVERTISERS.
A limited number of advertisements of approved character will be inserted in "THE TRUE WITNESS" at the rate of 10c per line for the first insertion, 5c per line for subsequent insertions. Special rates for long term contracts on application. Advertisements for Teachers, Information Wanted, &c., 50c per line for the first insertion, 25c per line for subsequent insertions. The large and increasing circulation of "THE TRUE WITNESS" makes it the best advertising medium in Canada.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

Subscribers in the country should always give the name of their Post Office. Those who remove should give the name of the old as well as the new Post Office. Remittances can be safely made by Registered Letter or Post Office Order. All remittances will be acknowledged by checking the date on the address label attached to paper. Subscribers will see by date on the address label when their subscription expires. Sample copies sent free on application. Parties wishing to become subscribers can do so through any responsible news agent, when there is none of our local agents in their locality. Address all communications to

The Post Printing & Publishing Co.

NO DISCOUNT FROM THE REGULAR SUBSCRIPTION PRICE OF \$1.50 PER ANNUM WILL BE ALLOWED IN ANY CASE EXCEPT WHEN PAYMENT IS MADE ABSOLUTELY IN ADVANCE, OR WITHIN 30 DAYS OF COMMENCEMENT OF SUBSCRIPTION.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 1886

THE vacancy created in the magistracy of Carleton, by the death of that staunch and honest Irishman, the late W. H. Waller, has not yet been filled. Among the several names mentioned in connection with the office, there is one which is especially deserving of commendation, that of Mr. P. J. Coffey, of Ottawa. The Local Government, in whose hands rests the right of appointment, could not find a man with better or sounder claims to the vacant magistracy. His capacity and honesty are testified to by his fellow citizens, and we hope the Government will not be slow in making an appointment that would be well received on all sides.

ARCHBISHOP WALSH, of Dublin, has just given the English Government a very suggestive hint, which they would do well not to ignore or forget. His Grace expressed the hope that England's statesmen would consent to a settlement of the Irish question. But if they refused to yield to constitutional agitation and scorned the fair means employed by the Irish people to urge their rightful demands, then look out for squalls. Archbishop Walsh in the plainest of terms warned the English Government against bringing about the sad result of desperate men, despairing of securing freedom by constitutional means, having recourse to dynamite and the dagger of the assassin. If John Bull is wise he'll take the hint and govern himself accordingly. If it was anybody else he wouldn't take a minute to choose between Home Rule or dynamite.

THE Montreal Gazette is trying to extract comfort out of Mr. Blake's London speech. Our contemporary "takes it that he has destroyed the castle of his Rouge allies." The Gazette would take anything it could get in its present distress, but we really think it "takes" too much when it tries to put Mr. Blake on record as being opposed to the men who condemn the Government for its maladministration of the North-West.

Our esteemed contemporary the Montreal Herald has managed to form a sounder opinion and a more just appreciation of the aim and effect of Mr. Blake's speech. The Herald says that those amongst the members of the Conservative party in Quebec who have really made up their minds to break with the Government will find sufficient encouragement in Mr. Blake's candid and cautious utterances, "to lead them to believe that the result of the discussion of North-West matters at the next session of Parliament will be sufficiently grave to justify a drawing together of all who, from whatever cause, are dissatisfied with the Government's administration of affairs in that Territory."

THE annual reports on the state of trade and agriculture in Ireland indicate a revival, which very few expected. The returns for the past year show substantial gains in the quantities of the crops gathered. The yield of wheat, oats, barley, rye and potatoes was 135,386 tons greater than in 1884. The increase in stock was 4,916 tons, and in hay 333,320 tons. Of the manufacturing industries only the linen trade is described as being in a bad condition. This is due in a great measure to the increasing foreign competition. The partial stoppage of the linen mills has thrown many operatives out of employment, and they are now counting hopefully on assistance from the coming Irish Parliament in the way of protection. The reported improvement in crops does not include the western coast districts of Ireland, where there is so much distress at present, owing to the failure of the herring and other fisheries.

SOME of our contemporaries are in the habit of referring to the men who served in the late Northwest expeditionary force as "British soldiers." We always thought, however, that the troops who served in that campaign were simply Canadian militiamen. The only men we would call "British soldiers" were General Middleton and a few of his staff

officers. The greater part of the remainder belonged to the militia force of the Dominion of Canada, were commanded by Canadian militia officers, and all were paid out of the treasury of the country. England had nothing to do with it. The men who went to the Northwest were Canadian militiamen and not "British soldiers." Men went up there, and plenty of them, who would not pull a trigger or England, but who would, and did, risk their lives to preserve law and order in the Dominion. Not that they disliked the half-breeds or were thirsty for their gore, but they went to support the law and bring back peace to the land. The very flag they fought under was not the flag of England, but it was the flag of England with the important addition of the Dominion coat of arms quartered on its folds.

HOME RULE OR DYNAMITE.

The Dublin Freeman's Journal says that the British Cabinet at its last meeting discussed the propriety of issuing a proclamation declaring the National League an illegal association.

I Lord Salisbury and his Tory hounds do anything so foolish and suicidal they will, thereby, give the strongest reason d'être to dynamite and other avenging associations. The British Government should bear this fully in mind, that if they try to practice any of their fancy and old-time oppression or repression of the National representatives or the National organizations of the Irish people, they will simply make it imperative for Irishmen to have recourse to scientific instead of constitutional methods for the acquisition of their rights. As Archbishop Walsh very plainly put it, the question is being narrowed down to this alternative—either grant Home Rule or be prepared for dynamite. If the entire moral force of the entire Irish nation backed by the sympathy and support of the entire civilized world, cannot persuade England to do the fair and square thing, then moral force has got to be superseded by physical force. As Ireland has no hundred ton guns, no army, no navy, no torpedoes, it is quite evident that the physical force, typified by these institutions, could not be availed of by the Irish people. What then? Are the Irish people to remain powerless and defenceless and allow themselves to be trampled on like so many worms? Not by any means! Science has advanced too far not to permit of terrible retaliation, with little expense and less effort. The fact that Ireland is without ordinary engines of destruction to protect herself will not be accepted by a desperate people as a reason why extraordinary means should not be employed to bring the enemy to terms. A man to save his wife and child and everything against his would-be murderer, and nobody finds fault with him. Let England beware and not invite a policy of retaliation which will be more dangerous and destructive than any effort of her army and navy. Let England remember that the world has come to look upon the policy of exterminating a people by oppression and starvation as a greater crime than the use of dynamite by that people to secure food and liberty.

ARCHBISHOPS TACHÉ AND O'BRIEN ON THE REBELLION.

THE Montreal Daily Witness quotes the remarkable judgment passed by Archbishop O'Brien, of Halifax, on the North-West rebellion, its cause and its results, and says:—"Archbishop O'Brien, of Halifax, takes his eloquent harp to a very different strain from that adopted by the French hierarchy, both in Quebec and in the North-West. We should presume the latter know more about the Riel matter than His Grace of Halifax." Our esteemed contemporary is very much mistaken, and its language is very liable to deceive others.

One would imagine from a perusal of the Witness' comment that Archbishop O'Brien was opposed by the French Canadian Bishops in his views on the rebellion. That is not the case. Archbishop O'Brien with Archbishop Taché are the only two prelates who have pronounced directly and squarely on the merits of the rebellion. All the other Bishops have simply alluded to the political agitation and given counsel and warning to their flocks not to go to extremes in their anger against a guilty government. Not one of these Bishops has discussed the cause of the rebellion or its consequences, and not one of them has told the faithful that Sir John Macdonald and his government are not to be turned out if the people see fit to do so. Such a prohibition is not within their obligations, their competence or their right, as Archbishop Taché himself so forcibly put it in his memorable manifesto, which all Canadians should read and read over again. This is what the great Archbishop of the North-West said:—"Let those who have a vote to give, whether in parliament or on the hustings, weigh all according to their inmost conscience and in the balance of their love of country, and then let them vote according to their convictions; such is their right and their duty."

Now, what is the right and the duty of a citizen will and can never find any interference or obstruction to the hands of a Catholic Bishop. Consequently their utterances cannot be taken as either a warning or a prohibition against taking part in the

agitation to overthrow a Ministry which, in the estimations of the electors, is unfit to govern the country, and has lost the public confidence.

We have thus shown that the French Bishops have dealt exclusively with incidents and events which have no direct relation to the rebellion, while the pronouncement of Archbishop O'Brien is directly on the rebellion itself. Consequently the Daily Witness will have some difficulty in substantiating its silly assertion that His Grace tunes his eloquent harp to a very different strain from that adopted by the French Bishops both in Quebec and in the North-West.

It is a rather notable and significant fact that the two prelates who pronounced upon the cause of the rebellion have in the clearest and the most emphatic terms declared that the responsibility of it rested, as THE POST has from the very beginning claimed and demonstrated, upon the shoulders of the Government at Ottawa. Archbishop Taché said:—

"Stop making use of my name to defend the Government. They are responsible for the blood spilt and for the rebellion."

Then, in his manifesto, His Grace wrote:—"Minds too superficial alas! or too interested to take a serious and impartial view of our difficulties, consider that they have accomplished their duties as citizens by exclaiming: 'Riel is the cause of all the harm; it was he who did it all; he has paid for it, the country is safe now.' This explanation is so unreasonable that if it were accepted, we might expect new disturbances in the near future. Therefore, it is in deceiving oneself or striving to deceive others, to throw on one man alone the causes of the misfortunes which we all deplore."

Now, ye Pharisees and hypocrites who are making use of Episcopal documents and Papal Encyclicals to prevent the people of Canada from exercising their rights and accomplishing their duty in the present crisis of our national life, what have ye to say to that supreme and impartial judgment of a great Catholic Archbishop? And what have ye to say to that noble and eloquent endorsement of the French Prelate of the West by the Irish Prelate of the East. Read the following words of Archbishop O'Brien, and tell us if the Catholic Church is insensible to the sufferings and wrongs of an oppressed people, even if they only be savages and half-breeds, or if she is not always ready to uphold the cause of humanity and justice, and appreciate the struggles made for the acquisition of the people's rights.

These are the sentiments and views of Archbishop O'Brien:—

"There is a recent foul stain on our page, which a partisan press and interested cabal of notaries are vainly trying to make 'and lifeless.' In vain: the word that twice in three centuries stayed the march of robbers and secured legal recognition of the rights of a people threatened with extermination will never be cult-d occurred."

The spirit of the Church is to-day what it has been in all times and through all ages, against tyranny and oppression and on the side of the weak and oppressed.

HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN.

If the Queen of England is not more careful she may live to hear her throne tottering about her ears. This thing of showing preference to one political party, before another, is a dangerous experiment for her to attempt this late in her reign. But she did it with Disraeli and she is doing it with the present administration in Britain. She bolstered up "the descendant of the independent thief," as O'Connell called the dead Benjamin, and she is now putting her shoulder to the wheel in propping up the doer-at-know-where he stands Salisbury. The people of Great Britain are in no humor for this kind of thing. They want the Queen to keep her hands off—to govern but not to rule. Her strongest claim to the admiration of her British subjects hitherto has been that she did not interfere in politics. But latterly this claim has been disallowed. And by "British subjects" we mean residents of Great Britain only, and not even all of them. Irishmen are not "Britons," and they may be left out of reckoning. But the Prince of Wales plays his cards much better than his royal mother. He will not, it is said, dabble in politics on any account. He knows too well that to do so might mean the doom of the throne. This is the people's sage, and Albert Edward understands it. As a constitutional king he may some day be acceptable, and Great Britain and Ireland might be well satisfied to allow him to become one, but as a partisan they would not put up with him for an hour. If Her Majesty was well advised she would do as her son does—let politics alone. If she doesn't, well, if she doesn't, the people of Great Britain and Ireland will soon have less to pay in dowries for her children. There will be one less market for German beggar princes who go a wooing, and yet this old world will jog along pretty much as usual, and the stars will wink away as if they had nothing else to do.

ORANGEISM AGAINST HOME RULE.

The London Daily News has sent a special commissioner (Mr. Macdonald) to Ireland to collect data concerning the attitude of the bulk of the Irish Protestants on the question of Home Rule. Mr. Macdonald feels confident and already predicts that the majority of the moderate "Loyalists," who are now more or less identified with the Orange party, will sooner or later throw in their lot with the party of patriotism. Although the Orange extremists are straining every nerve to embitter the strife, a change is working throughout Ulster, and the rebel province of '88 may be brought back to a sense of the duty it owes to all Ireland at the present crisis. Parnell has already conquered more than half of the black north and the remainder will come in

time. Mr. Macdonald says that what will chiefly lead to this happy reunion is the popular disgust at Orange bragadoocio and virulence which are rapidly driving the Moderates into the ranks of the Nationalists. The reasoning, fair-minded and intelligent portion of the Protestant community and even of the Orange party itself are surely drifting toward Home Rule. Mr. William Shaw, ex-M.P. from Cork and formerly chief lieutenant of Isaac Butt's Home Rule phalanx, speaking as an Irish Protestant, said recently: "But I think now the plan Mr. Parnell has in his mind—a revival of the constitution of 1782 adapted to present circumstances—will cause less disruption and work more satisfactorily than the federal scheme. When I was urged to offer myself to a constituency as a moderate Home Ruler, and to make an effort to reorganize that section of the party, I refused, as I believe the country has entirely departed from the policy and the mode of action usually associated with that section. I might differ from Mr. Parnell and his followers on some of their modes of action, but I believe there is no difference between us as to the end we seek. Hence I discontinue in every possible manner anything like opposition to the national candidate on the part of any professed Home Ruler. The country is for the National demand unmistakably—not the Catholic alone, but I am convinced from my own knowledge that more than half the Protestant population of Ireland would vote against the present arrangement between England and Ireland, and would be in favor of a settlement of the lines which I hope will be adopted by the Irish party."

Contrast these temperate and sensible views of an intelligent man with the ravings of the Orange fanatics, and ask which voice will the British Government listen to?

We give below a few instances of the seditious and murderous talk of the gang that want to rule or ruin:—

Sir John Leale, in a speech at Glaslough, exhorted all Protestants, in the event of an Irish Parliament being established, to refuse to pay taxes, to refrain from electing representatives to such a Parliament, to disobey its orders, and generally to boycott the Catholic assemblage. He advised the Orangemen not to act rashly. Doubtless, he said, it would be a pleasure to shoot the Catholics like rats, but it would be wiser for them to reserve their cartridges until their wives and sisters were carried off. At all events, it was imperative that the men of Ulster should arm themselves and prepare for the worst.

Capt. Maxwell, speaking at Kells, County Meath, denounced the Parnellites as diabolical tyrants, who misappropriated their own funds and preached murder, robbery, arson, and treason from morning to night.

The Rev. Mr. Carter, in his speeches, was more moderate than the laymen. He said he was prepared to support an Irish Parliament if it would solemnly record its allegiance to imperial rule and abjure Papal supremacy and jurisdiction.

Such sentiments as contained in the above are a disgrace to humanity, and that is why we insist that Orangemen ought to be shot dead unmercifully whenever it shows its vile and repugnant form.

"DESIGNING POLITICIANS."

The Hon. John Costigan said that the men who had determined to fight the Government over the Riel question were "designing politicians." By that he meant men who were using the sympathies of the people in order to advance their personal ends. Very well. A few days after Mr. M. C. Cameron, M. P., said that the Hon. John Costigan had received an enormous tract of timber land at 50c per acre; we replied by insisting that to accept this statement until proof was furnished. If the lands were obtained by honest trade we would rejoice; but if obtained because John Costigan was a party man and a minister of the Crown, we predicted that these were "designing politicians"—might come to a terrible end. And so they have. They have come home with a vengeance. To-day the Hon. John Costigan stands before the Irish Catholics of Canada in his true light; stands as he never stood before. With a pretence of Irish patriotism on his lips he was all the time using the sympathies of the people to give him strength with the Government in order to advance his personal interests. The New Brunswick school question and Home Rule resolutions were all "designs" of this most astute of all statesmen "politicians." It was money he wanted and it was money he got, and here are the proofs as published by us in a letter signed "Facts" last evening.

"In July 1882, one month after Sir John was sustained at the polls, Short, Costigan, Hay and Anderson obtained a lease for 50,000 acres of grazing lands. This will be found in the sessional papers for 1885, No. 34, page 7."

In the same year, and in the same month, the Hon. John Costigan applied for and got north half of sec. 14 township 6, range 19, west of 2nd principal meridian, 244 acres of valuable coal land. See sessional papers 1883, No. 30, page 2.

Still in 1882, but this time in December, and only a few months in office, "John Ryan Costigan, a son of the Minister of Inland Revenue, obtained south half of sec. 17, township 2, range 8, west of 2nd principal meridian, valuable coal lands."

"In 1885, John Costigan," still continues "Facts" assured from the Government, of which he was and is a member, a bonus of \$40,000 for a railway from Rivière du Loup to Edmonton, which runs into Victoria, the county he represents. See votes and proceedings for 1885, page 664, and if there is any doubt about his having made enough out of his "designing politics," we don't throw in the three permits Short and Costigan got in 1883, to cut timber in the disputed territory, as can be seen by the sessional

papers for that year, No. 118, page 2, and Mr. Costigan's letter on page 709.

And it must be remembered that these are only the public grabs of which we know. How many there were of which we know nothing we can only guess. But we know enough to understand the man at last. We have now proof enough to enable us to see that he has been "on the make" all the time, and while pretending to fight the battles of our people, he took very good care to do it in such a way that would enhance his own importance in order to make him all the more valuable to his Orange chief.

But it is better that the Irish Catholics of Canada should know their man. In future he and they will understand each other better. They might have suspected, from the associates he kept, that all was not well, but now "Facts" are against him, and he will be remembered among our people as one of those "designing politicians" who used the Irish people for their own selfish ends.

RIDEAU HALL.

Rideau Hall and the Governor-General costs the country \$174,717 a year. That is a nice little bill for a young country to foot for a vice-regal residence at its political capital. To be sure there are a few entertainments given—an odd tobogganing party makes merry on the grounds, and the members of Parliament are regularly invited to put their legs under the people's mahogany. In its way that kind of thing is right enough, but when three pianos are purchased in one year at a cost of \$2,600, and three more are hired at a cost of \$352, many of the taxpayers will think that they are paying a little too much for their whistle. This is a trifle, perhaps, but it is such trifles that make the bag swell and pile the bills of costs against the people's pocketbook. When we see \$3,200 paid one year for light and fuel; \$135 for newspapers; \$1,756 for telephones and telegrams; \$6,925 for travelling expenses; \$1,572 for stationery; \$6,392 for keeping the garden in order, and \$53,383 for furniture for sixteen years, we begin to think that the Governor-General is not badly provided for, and we feel like having a good all-round constitutional grumble. It would not be so bad if this money was given to a man of the people's choice, but when we consider that the British Government send us out some of their rag, toy and bob-tail "noblemen" to govern us in this land, it cannot be wondered if we open the cabinets of our national brain and ask experts in insanity to take a peep inside and tell us seriously if this country is in its senses, while some little midsummer night cherub, looking down from aloft, will cunningly unite and say: "What fools these mortals be."

THE "UNION JACK."

Ireland will get Home Rule some day. No doubt about that. It may be Gratian's Home Rule; it may be a Federal Home Rule; it may be Home Rule such as we have in Canada, but it will be Home Rule of some kind. Well, when Ireland is settling her Home Rule account with Great Britain, there is the question of the flag to be arranged. The Union was a fraud. All men admit that. Byron rightly called it "the Union of the shark with its prey," and historians in all lands admit that it was a national swindle made a wrong. Now if the Union itself was a fraud the flag that represents the Union must be a fraud too. The people of Ireland did not consent to the Legislative Union of the two countries. It was forced on them against their will. They never accepted it as a binding engagement, and they have never ceased to protest against it from the day it was made "law" down to the present hour. And if they repudiated having had, act or part in the transaction so do they repudiate the flag that symbolizes it. The "Union Jack" may, as "law," be the flag of the Irish people. It may float over Dublin Castle and flutter over the parapets which guard the Cove of Cork, but before the British colors are sincerely accepted by the Irish people they must have the Shamrock, the Shamrock, or a spot of green somewhere worked upon their folds. Here in Canada the "Union Jack," or, at least, the British ensign, carries the Dominion coat of arms along with it—why not the new flag, which will symbolize Home Rule for Ireland and a hearty union with the Empire, carry "The Dear Little Shamrock" clustering on its borders?

LIP LOYALTY.

The Witness says that the Queen "acts wisely" in again appearing in public. Her Majesty opening the new Parliament, in the embellished pageantry of a royal show, is, according to the Witness, a wise act. Now, let us see where the "wisdom" comes in. The last time the Queen opened Parliament was during Disraeli's term of office. Gladstone then went into power, and the Queen never darkened the doors of the House of Lords during the time the Liberal chief guided the destinies of the Empire. Gladstone's term expires, and a general election is held. The returns from the different constituencies are only half in when the Queen sends for the Conservative chief, and shows her anxiety for his triumph. When the elections are over the Conservatives retain power, although in a minority, and the Queen once more appears in public in order to bolster up the tottering power of her favorite administration. No Government that England ever had stood so noticeably between the devil and the deep sea as the present Government in Britain. Without the Parnellites, the Liberals are in the ascendant, and yet, in face of this fact, we are told that the Queen "acts wisely" in letting her subjects understand she is a Tory, and that she will only "appear in public" when Tories rule the roost over there in London. Now this kind of lip loyalty we hear too much of in this country. It is the "loyalty" of the helot to his master. The time is past when the Queen

is above the frank, but courteous, criticism of the press. When she does wrong, as she often does when in spite of all legal fiction to the contrary, she is criticized by the English papers, and it is only here that "loyalty" becomes sycophantic in its tone. But it won't do—it won't do.

WHY?

Why can't a French Canadian or an Irish Catholic be Premier of this Dominion? We ask the question because people generally appear to think that neither the one nor the other can ever hope to lead a government in this country. And we want to know the reason. Of course, in the public press, we will be told there is no reason, and such a contingency as a French Canadian or an Irish Catholic Premier is not an impossibility. We hear platitudes about "a fair field," and all the rest. But we know what that means. It means that speech is being used to conceal the thoughts. But speak to any man you meet, British, or even the French Canadians and the Irish Catholics themselves, and ask them this question in conversation—Why can't so-and-so, a French Canadian, or so-and-so, an Irish Catholic, hope to become Premier of Canada, and you know what their answer will be. They will frankly tell you that no French Canadian or Irish Catholic can ever be at the head of a government in this country. They all appear to accept the situation as inevitable and, by doing so, contribute to their own humiliation. We grant that in the exigencies of parties, as now constituted, that it might be difficult for an Irish Catholic to form a government in Canada, but we do not grant the eternal fitness of this state of affairs. Our nation produced the greatest orator that ever stood within the walls of the Parliament in this country, and it may produce his equal as a statesman, without his failings in other respects, to-morrow or the day after. Why, then, should we admit that an Irish Catholic cannot be a Premier here. As for the French Canadians, they have a greater claim, because they have greater opportunities. If we were French we would insist on having a French Canadian Premier, and we would do our best to prevent the exclusion of our people from the highest office in the gift of the people. That is the kind of "backing down" we would show in the present crisis. What say the French Canadians?

HOW THE INDIANS ARE TREATED.

THE Rev. John McDougall, a missionary among the Indians of the North-West, lets in some very fierce light upon the manner in which the government treats the Indians. He describes the policy of the Indian Department as a "cut-throat one" and denounces the officials for their shameful and immoral lives, some of whom were a disgrace to the lowest barbarism, let alone civilization. These are frightful charges and show that there must be something terribly rotten somewhere. The Rev. gentleman in the course of his letter writes: "How often we have preached the gospel of patience, have tried to show that the great distance, the lack of speedy transport, the tremendous cost of bringing material into this big country, were some of the reasons why the Government was behind hand. Of course we could not find, nor did we try to find, any excuse for the promises made, but not fulfilled, for the cut-throat policy often exhibited and sometimes enforced by officials of the Indian Department, for the shameful and immoral lives of many of the employees of the same. Some of these were a disgrace to the lowest barbarism, let alone civilization. Nor how could we, when earnestly trying to teach the Indians habits of industry and thrift, be expected to excuse the laziness and incompetency of many sent into the country to teach the wards of the Government these lessons we have been working for them to acquire for so many years. Moreover, could we be blamed when we felt strongly that something was wrong in a system which allowed such men in its branch of the service. Give us men as Indian Department employees of every grade, who will be true to their country, if not to their God, and who will have manhood enough to refrain from licentiousness and blasphemy and drunkenness and laziness, and on the other hand will have force of character enough to command the respect of all parties, native and foreign, and who will, by precept and example, teach the Indian to develop an independent spirit, which will make him industrious, thrifty and law abiding."

MR. BLAKE'S SPEECH.

The Hon. Edward Blake has spoken. His speech is full of promise and of hope for the country, but full of censure and reprobation of the Government's administration of public affairs. Mr. Blake has examined the wounds and the distress from which the country is suffering, and he has placed a mighty grip upon the culprits who have inflicted this suffering upon our young confederation, determined to bring them to justice and to have them punished for their crimes in office. In olden days the ministers would have been impeached as traitors to their trust; but in those modern times the penalty for the men who by their criminal neglect and incapacity produced the sad results of the rebellion is milder—"too mild," says Mr. Blake, "for such an offence as theirs." This mild penalty, which consists in a simple withdrawal of the power they have abused, of the confidence they have betrayed, the people are called upon to inflict, and Mr. Blake adds that he will not so far despair of his country as to doubt the answer made to that call. By this he gives us to understand that he realizes the full seriousness of the situation, and that he is prepared to accept and fulfill the task of punishing the men whom the people have condemned. There has been a lot of rubbish written