

of any city of the British Empire, but that they should be treated as outlaws for banding together to uphold these sentiments, and so treated in the name of that Very Sovereign whose throne it is their avowed duty to maintain—this surely cannot be! Are we not dreaming that such things are? It must seem incredible to the people of other nations.

Not a bit "incredible," and no one is dreaming but the Rev. Mr. Campbell himself who will be cured of all his incredulity if he takes a few doses of Macaulay's History of England.

THE LEGAL QUESTION.

The Gazette of Wednesday last lays some stress upon the opinion of Mr. Archibald about the illegality of the Orange Association. No doubt Mr. Archibald's opinion is well worth consideration, but it appears to us that that opinion is antagonistic to the Orange men, and not in favor of them. Mr. Archibald says—

"The serious difficulty which exists in reference to the action of the authorities on the 12th still remains. Granting the society to be an illegal confederacy, is a meeting of members of that society on the streets necessarily an unlawful assembly, so as to justify their dispersion by the magistrates in their capacity of conservators of the peace? The eminent counsel whose opinion has been published are well aware that an unlawful assembly is entirely different from an assembly of persons who belong to an illegal association. The idea of violence, threatening tumult or public terror is inseparably connected with the words 'unlawful assembly,' and without these elements the conservators of the peace have no right to disperse persons making use of the streets. It would be the same as if they were to use their authority in dispersing an Oddfellows' picnic."

The Gazette, in its comments upon this says that the opinion of Mr. Archibald is "opposed to those of the four gentlemen upon whose opinion the Mayor appears to have acted." We do not think so. In fact, we think the opinion of Mr. Archibald sustains the opinion of the four gentlemen in question. The distinction is that a society may be illegal, but that the meeting of the members of that society may not be an unlawful assembly, so as to justify their dispersion by the magistrates. What, then, constitutes an "unlawful assembly," such an assembly as would justify the magistrates in dispersing? Mr. Archibald says that "the idea of violence, threatening tumult, or public terror, is inseparably connected with 'unlawful assembly,' and without these elements the conservators of the peace have no right to disperse persons making use of the streets." Granted, for argument sake. But does Mr. Archibald deny that the Orange procession did not "threaten tumult, public terror," &c., &c.? Will he tell us that the Orange procession was not likely to be attended with that "idea of violence" on their part which constituted the procession an "unlawful assembly," and, therefore, to be dispersed by the magistrates. We think that Mr. Archibald has strengthened the position of the four gentlemen who pronounced the Order illegal, and we expect that events will prove it to be so.

NEGLECT OF THE INDUSTRIES OF CANADA.

Had the 'loyal' element of the population of the Old Thirteen Colonies had its way we might have continued in that condition of slow and herpetonic vitality in which Canada still remains, and been prepared to pray that Her Majesty Queen Victoria be pleased to send one of her sons "to govern us." We quote this remarkable paragraph from an editorial article, in a recent number of the New York Herald, reviewing the national progress and industrial achievements of our neighbors since the era of their Independence.

With regard to the Sovereignty in question as adverse to the national progress of Canada, and to the onward march of British India, the arguments of our contemporary might, perhaps, have been sufficient in the exciting days of the Georges; but to-day, they are happily far from the mark. But, that we are yet in a condition unbecoming a people of our race, freedom, pretensions and traditions,—in a condition not in keeping with the industrial spirit of the times in which we live,—in a condition that is anything but promising or encouraging; that we have not exhibited the energy, perseverance, push and enterprising spirit of our neighbors, must, however painful or humiliating, and from whatever cause, be admitted.

There is not a period in the history of Canada, as regards the decline of her mineral development, her manufacturing industries, her national wealth, so appalling as the last four years of the eleven of her national independence. The demon of finance-trade depression raged with all his fury and persistence. Our sugar-refining industry became extinguished. The entire volume of our direct trade with China, Japan, South America, and the West Indies dwindled down to insignificance. With the exception of a few coal works at Cape Breton, the boot and shoe and a few hardware establishments in Montreal, our industries were deserted. Many of our leading merchants have crossed the lines and took permanent refuge in the great Atlantic and Pacific cities of the United States. And not unrequently have the streets of our towns and cities been the scenes of lawless disorder and bread riots by the starving, the unemployed looking to our governments, corporations, capitalists and employers for relief—work or bread. We have added some \$50,000,000 net to our net public debt without increasing the assets, for which we have little or nothing to show for it. Other nations have increased the net public debt, \$100,000,000 in 1874. We have added \$50,000,000 to-day. Yet no people could be freer from monarchical interference or adverseness than we; no peo-

ple could boast of a more brilliant ruler than we can in the person of Lord Dufferin.

The case has been worse in British India. There desolation and famine pervaded the land. What a few years ago were thriving manufacturing and mining villages, towns and cities, are to-day ruin and waste land held by European mortgagees. Nor is it easy to imagine Lord Lytton as the dispenser of all this, for no complaint is ever heard of against his government there.

The Australian colonies are little better. With a population of about two and a quarter millions, with all the advantages of their gold, coal, copper, lead, and zinc fields, they managed to run up a debt of some \$300,000,000. Of this sum the colony of New Zealand alone, with a population of about three times that of the city of Montreal, has \$93,000,000. In this respect we are more economical than our kindred brethren the antipodes; but the antipodes are more industrious than we, though, to them, manufacturing is yet almost unknown. With a population a little more than half ours, as we have already shown, they export nearly double what we do.

Since the dawn of Confederation, 11 years ago, when we assumed the maintenance of national dignity, the balance of trade against us averaged 23 1/2 million dollars annually; or aggregated the enormous amount of \$212,204,000, which, of course, we had to pay in gold, except a million or so that the more unfortunate of our business men paid by bankruptcy. This amount, except such of the imports that made it up as are yet unconsumed, and that is insignificant, we have grown poorer in trade alone. To this may be added the \$1,617,000 which, according to Dr. Tupper's figuring—and unlike many other of the Dr.'s calculations, this stands undefined—was lost by the steel rails purchase, the interest of which alone at 5 per cent., would nearly support the ministry; unless, indeed, another dash into higher salaries be made. Had this sum of money been added to the Sinking Fund instead of placed in doubtful speculation, our internal taxes or national burden would at least be \$80,000 less.

Next come the burdens of provincial and municipal extravagance; and in Quebec, with the cost of suppressing Orange turbulence, they form quite an item, while Nova Scotia is not far behind.

The Canadian Pacific Railway is another future elephant. When finished, it is about all we can show for our public indebtedness; not only what that is now, but what it will be then. Till the earnings are sufficient to cover running expenses and the interest upon the cost of its construction, the road will be a dead loss. And we know, by the United States Pacific Railroad, that the earnings for years and years to come will not reach that sum. This road, now some years running, with forty million patrons, never yet paid any interest or dividend. How, then, can ours, with only four millions, less industrious and enterprising? The interest, therefore, and, perhaps, part of the running expenses, must be paid either by levying higher internal taxes, or by higher duties on imports.

Now, the worst feature is that very soon we cannot import; because, at our present rate of progress, the steady annual balance of trade against us will assuredly exhaust our gold supply. And if we neglect developing the resources of the country neglect our industries, trade nothing, do nothing, earn nothing, what have we got to levy internal taxes upon? But for all this, we are not opposed to the scheme. By no means. We believe it a wise undertaking, for we know it will greatly tend to develop the material resources of the nation, and give new life to our mercantile pursuits. Our purpose and desire are simply to point out as clearly as possible the situation of affairs, that no one among us be ignorant of the debt that the country carries, and the urgent necessity to provide for it; which can only be done by home industry, energy and prudence.

With regard to the cause of business stagnation and finance panic, various minor theories have been advanced. But to no curing effect, for few seem willing to agree upon the cause. Nor is it easy. Like war and rebellion, finance panic and business stagnation or depression never come, for they are brought; the cause varies with the race, with the country. In India, the chief agent of the crash was famine; in China and Japan, famine and rebellion; in Europe, ambition, war, labor strikes, unwise speculation and extravagance; in South America, famine and perpetual rebellion; in the United States, fire, over-speculation, extravagance and depreciated currency; and in Canada: ah! Canada, ill is thy treatment. No war, no rebellion, no famine crushed you. But your 212 million dollars balance of trade in eleven years—the wages of importation rather than producing it for yourself—which you paid in cash your neglect of your own industries, your sumptuous extravagance, your unwise legislation, and your steel rail policy crushed you. Thus have we invited the hard times; and now, to overcome the situation, to effect our prosperity, ensure our national future, and preserve our sacred institutions, the reverse is necessary. We can use our past experience as a guide in the far future. We own by inheritance and prowess and honest dealing, land replete with gold, silver, copper, iron, coal, and other treasures, all of the finest quality to be found anywhere throughout the broad extent of this Continent; land fertile to an extraordinary degree; and, to all Europe, upon which to rely, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Gulf of Mexico to the Arctic Ocean, a free and fertile soil, and a climate of freedom and plenty, and a population of all the common races of this continent, and all the common causes for the ruin of our country.

WHAT THE PEOPLE SAY.

THE LEGAL DECISION.

The following letter appeared in the Gazette Thursday morning—

To the Editor of the Gazette: Sir,—During my absence from the city, I had occasion to read the communications criticizing the opinion signed by myself and three of my colleagues, relating to the legality of the Orange Association in the Province of Quebec.

I intend to answer but one communication, that of "Lex," who claims to be an older lawyer than any of us, and with more special occasions to look into such like questions.

It is to be regretted that our senior should have attacked us, through the public press, anonymously. Possibly he had a reason for it, having, as he admits, given his opinion "hurriedly and crudely;" and I now propose to show that he well might be ashamed of that opinion.

"Lex" refers to the Preamble of the Ordinance with a view of showing that it was solely directed to suppressing seditious assemblies, and he designates this provision of law as a statute against treason—to use his own words: "It is a statute against treason—'felony,' as the ordinance called it, and it is itself based on that broad, deep, unwritten law, which lies at the basis of the British Throne, against all treason, overt or concealed."

From this argument "Lex" draws a deduction, that Sec. 6 is to be interpreted by the preamble, and to be restricted in its application to "seditious associations and practices."

Assuming, as "Lex" contends, that the preamble is to be read in interpreting Ch. 10 of C. S. L. C., as an old lawyer he should have known that, although the ordinance was mainly directed against sedition and treason and that by the 1st section, those engaged in any seditious or treasonable purpose are declared guilty of felony; still the 6th section provided for a different class of offence, that is, the existence of secret societies or associations, the members whereof and all aiders and abettors or supporters of such societies, are declared guilty of an unlawful combination or confederacy, but their offence is not declared felony.

So that by the 1st section, the felony is made punishable by transportation for the term of not less than 21 years, and those taking the oath referred in said section to a term of not exceeding seven years; whereas the misdemeanor created by the 6th section is punishable by transportation for a term not exceeding seven years, or to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years.

Having shown that the ordinance, as well as chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, provide for two classes of offences, viz., felonies and misdemeanors, I now propose to show that "Lex" is wrong in his deduction—that the preamble controls the whole of the enacting clauses in this interpretation.

The 37 Geo. III, c. 123, S. 1, recites, "that wicked and evil disposed persons had attempted to seduce His Majesty's forces and subjects from their duty and allegiance and to incite them to acts of mutiny and sedition, and had endeavored to give effect to their wicked and traitorous proceedings by imposing upon the persons whom they had attempted to seduce the pretended obligation of oaths unlawfully administered."

From this preamble it was inferred in a case well known to the profession, and which "Lex" can easily find, if he gives himself the trouble, that the statute was directed against combinations for purposes of mutiny and sedition, and could not reach a case where the fact arose out of a private dispute between persons engaged in the same trade. The oath in that case was, "You shall be true to every journeyman shearer, and not to hurt any of them, and you shall not divulge any of their secrets; so help you God."

The Court, in the case above referred to, upon the particular circumstances did not feel themselves called upon to give an express decision, but entertained no doubt that the case was within the statute. One of the learned judges expressed himself as follows:—It is true that the preamble is confined to their objects in enacting the statute; but it is nothing unusual in Acts of Parliament for the enacting part to go beyond the preamble; the remedy often extends beyond the particular act or mischief which first suggested the necessity of the law.

I might prolong this letter by referring to numerous other authorities, but I think I have said enough upon the authority and ruling of English judges to refute the absurd and erroneous opinion of "Lex."

Yours, &c., EDW. CARTER.

Montreal, 17th July, 1878.

THE ORANGE FLAG.

To the Editor of the Evening Post: Sir,—Some days ago the public were led to believe, by a statement in your columns, that important facts would be brought to light in connection with the Orange banner subscriptions, (a list of which was found in the possession of the grand marshal), and it was also hinted that the names of several parties when published in that connection would cause considerable surprise. Judging from the nature of the item, the Catholics of Montreal were on the tip toe of anxiety while awaiting the publication of the names of the subscribers, for it had been publicly reported that the banner fund had been subscribed to by more than one prominent Irish Catholic in the city. The following day, however, the readers of your paper were astonished to learn that you had, in a manner, contradicted your statement of the previous evening, by vouchsafing the information that there were no Catholic names on the list of subscribers to the Orange testimonial.

Now, Mr. Editor, I am in a position to know that your reporter, in making that statement, did so upon unreliable information, for the fact is that the High Constable, Mr. Bissonnette, has had the book containing the names in his possession ever since the 12th, and has allowed no person whatever to open it, much less to examine the contents. I am credibly informed that the list does contain the names of Irish Catholics, but of this I am not prepared to make any authoritative declaration, as the fact has not been made known officially. Time, however,

may reveal any secrets connected with the matter. In the meantime, the facts of the case are difficult to arrive at but it is thought before long the public will learn all about the flag, as well as the circumstances connected with its purchase and presentation.

Montreal, July 19th, 1878.

THE CHAMPIONSHIP.

To the Editor of the Evening Post: Sir,—According to the argument used by the Toronto Lacrosse Club, the decision of the referee is final. Well, sir, members of the Shamrock, and several gentlemen not connected with Shamrock—resident both in Toronto and Montreal—heard the referee, notwithstanding his denial of the fact, decide that there was a "foul" and that the game would have to be continued. He afterwards gave another "decision" under the grand stand. Which is the decision is the question?

Yours, LACROSSE.

Montreal, July 19, 1878.

VOLUNTEERS CHEERING FOR "KING BILLY."

To the Editor of the Evening Post: Sir,—Last Saturday afternoon the volunteers, (Argentine Rangers) on their way home from Montreal, when passing this quiet little village, amused themselves and Alderman Mercer of Montreal, by giving three cheers for King Billy and other kindred productions.

Yours truly, VISITOR.

St. Annes, Bout de L'Isle, July 16th, 1878.

THE TROUBLES.

To the Editor of the Evening Post: Sir,—The Young Irishmen of this city are about having their usual annual excursion, and the Toronto Telegram, for the sake of prolonging its miserable existence, is getting up an agitation, or, in other words, speaking in plain English, it is seeking to fire the Orange heart, so that they may slaughter us. Of course it draws the usual unfair comparison between the Orangemen, a secret and illegal society, and the Young Irishmen's Association, which is merely benevolent and national, and infers that because the former society was not allowed to march in procession through Montreal, we should in like manner be prohibited here. Of course there is no real analogy between the two associations; we offend no one, for, if I am correctly informed through the press, the times we play, "The Wearing of the Green" and "St. Patrick's Day," are regularly played by military bands in Her Majesty's service to the ear of royalty itself, while the insulting Orange party airs are strictly tabooed. The object of the Imperial authorities at present is to make Irishmen forget their wrongs, and hence they encourage Irish nationalists in at least, a small way, and just as the Jacobite songs "Bonnie Dundee" and "Johnny Cope," are played, so are the airs I have mentioned. For the rest, the Young Irishmen are well able to defend themselves even if the law does not protect them, but remembering the honorable manner in which the Toronto police acted on former occasions, we have full confidence we shall not be left to our own resources. The members of the Young Irishmen's Society are almost to a man Canadian born, and take little interest in the feuds and struggles of by-gone times.

Yours respectfully, YOUNG IRISHMAN.

Toronto, July 18th, 1878.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EVENING POST.

Sir,—Being one of those unfortunate Star-styled "roughs" and "river thieves" that visited Montreal on the morning of the 12th to help and strengthen the hands of your energetic and order-loving Mayor, allow me to make a few remarks in answer to the charges trumped up against us by this bigoted and intolerant journal. No name is bad enough, no epithet vile enough, for this quasi-respectable Star to fling at us, and I am at a loss to know how we deserve it. What great crime did the Quebecers commit while in Montreal? Will the records of your Police or Recorder's Courts bear the Star out in its charges? I think not.

He is mad with us for not being attired in broadcloth. Well, Mr. Editor, we did not go to Montreal on a picnic. Our business in your city was to stamp out at once and for ever this fanatical and illegal organization, whose members would glory in seeing our fair Province one sea of blood, so long as the Catholics were the victims and our brave volunteers the cause; but they will never see their ends accomplished—the handwriting is on their walls, and Orangism in the Province of Quebec is numbered with the things of the past.

He calls us "river thieves" and "roughs." Out of the two hundred Quebecers that arrived in your city on that memorable day, I am the only man that ever harbored a sailor; and, that I have always dealt with them honestly and fairly, no one that knows me will dispute. As to his charge of "roughs," it is only downright ignorance that would cause any man to single out such prominent Quebecers as Mr. Charles Camfield, stevedore, late of Pensacola, Mr. John Tardif, spar merchant, Mr. P. E. Lane, merchant, Mr. Lawrence Lawson, steamboat owner; and I might go on to the end of the two hundred, did space permit.

But, Mr. Editor, it is easily seeing where the shoe pinches. Were we "Young Britons" going to celebrate the anniversary of the glorious and immortal Hackett's death, our praises would be sung by the Star, Witness and other respectable Protestant journals; but no man can serve two masters—it is impossible to please God and the Devil at the same time. I am determined to serve God and my religion as well as I can, leaving the Star and its Orange patrons to "William," the Devil of the Boyne.

Apologizing, Mr. Editor, for occupying so much of your valuable space, I remain, Yours truly, MICHAEL HICK.

Quebec, July 17, 1878.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EVENING POST.

Sir,—A sentinel's duty in the British Army is one that requires energy, smartness and neatness in soldierlike bearing and a perfect understanding of all the orders in connection with his particular post and the guard in general. It is the one point in particular to which the commanders of the regular army look when considering the equipping of the soldiers, in fact, more so than when inspecting the regiment on what I may term a holiday inspection, when every one is prepared for the event, and therefore, on the lookout not to be caught unexpectedly. The late precautions taken by the military authorities in placing guards over the various arsenals, which, however commendable in a preservative point of view, has unfortunately brought to light the capability of our Volunteers for sentry duty. As representatives of the British soldier in this respect, they are a failure.

Yours faithfully, SOUTHERMAN.

Quebec, July 17, 1878.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EVENING POST.

Sir,—Conjecture is rife in reference to the probable successful tenderer for the Graving Dock works. There were ten tenders received: Falardeau, A. O'Brien & Charlton; F. E. McNamee & Co.; Curran & Co.; Shanly, Charlebois & Co.; Valier & Richard; Larkin

When one compares them with those apparently automatic men, who in reality are sentries, and whose praises as such, resound throughout the world, the comparison becomes so significant, that even the so-much abused "specials" would have compared favorably with them.

Now that their duty of protecting the arsenals has concluded, I may safely venture a few remarks for their future guidance if ever called upon to fulfil a similar duty.

Without one exception, the conduct of these guards has been otherwise than the bearing of soldiers. The individual laxity of the sentry while on his post was remarkable in the extreme. The slouching gait, the hump back, the indifferent attitude, the careless manner of carrying the rifle, the speaking to Jack, Tom, Harry or Bill when passing by, the slovenly manner of standing at ease, and perfect tout ensemble of a careless individual was fully carried out. Turkish sentries have been known to place their rifles up against the wall and coolly squatting down on the ground, draw out their chibouques, fill, light and smoke them with a most perfect calmness and stolidity as to the duties they had been appointed to look after. Between the two, the Turk is to be preferred, as in the one case enlightenment is professedly avowed, while in the other the indifference is naturally bred. This state of affairs is surely what was not expected from such men as those of Montreal, some of whom have the hardihood and conceit to think they can vie with Her Majesty's regular force in all matters. God help them, and we sincerely trust that however commendable as volunteers they may appear to our neighbors, that they will not be taken as a specimen of the regular British army. The difference is just exactly that of between chalk and cheese, or black and white.

Yours, etc., MURTAIRE.

Montreal, July 18, 1878.

[Our correspondent appears to think that volunteers should equal regulars, an expectation which is unreasonable. We have before this said that some portion of the time at "drill" should be spent in guard mounting, relieving sentries, etc. The volunteers are not what they should be, but it is as unfair to expect too much as it is mischievous to exact too little.]

THE VOLUNTEER QUESTION.

To the Editor of the Evening Post: Sir,—I landed on the shores of Canada some four or five years ago, and, as I am occasionally attacked with the disease known as cacochies veridendi, I write an odd letter to the Press. The first time I attempted that kind of thing in this country was about a month after my arrival, and my subject was "The volunteer system as it exists." I am a Scotch Catholic, and served in the volunteers in Scotland (the South Dumfriesshire) and having a penchant to the use of arms and having had nothing to do I joined the 10th Royals at Toronto, when they were on the point of going to Niagara Camp for their annual drill. They generally commence to recruit about this time in order to have a complete establishment, and my services were accepted. What caused me the good deal of surprise, however, was the mysterious manner of the officers and sergeants at the drill shed when I was introduced to them as a recruit. Colonel Rossall commanded the 10th at the time. They asked me my name, and when I told it they all went into a corner and held a consultation. The Colonel then said, "that is a good name enough," and the oath of allegiance was tendered to me. I went to Niagara with my battalion a few days after, and then it was that the mysterious manner of the officers was understood by me. To make a long story short I found that the Company I had joined was neither more nor less than an Orange Lodge, and that the nine other Companies were also Orange Lodges. I do not say all the members were Orangemen, several were Protestants having neither connection nor sympathy with the brethren, and a few were Catholics like myself, but the great majority were of the Lodges, and there was a lodge in each Company which formed the nucleus of the Company. I next learned that our sister battalion the "Queen's Own" was almost as bad, and as my circle of acquaintance widened among the country battalions I discovered that the division was one vast Orange centre.

We were just one day in camp when every tent belonging to the 10th, and half those of the whole division, was covered over with Orange mottoes, of which the following are a few specimens:—"No. 671, The Cavan Black Reds. Derry walls, no Surrender. The Protestant Boys will carry the Day. To—H—ll with the Pope," and so on in that endless variety with which you are doubtless well acquainted. A general order was issued prohibiting the defacing of the tents, but the boys only laughed and went on improving by adding an occasional likeness of the Pope in possession of his Satanic Majesty. You may imagine my feelings at finding myself in such a nest. Sunday came, and when the battalion was paraded for Divine service it was seen that there were only four Catholics in it; and I may say, en passant, that that was the last of them—they took precious good care they absented themselves on the next muster for service in camp. I will never mention the language used in the tents—it was too shocking; suffice it to say that, for my part, I would much prefer being a month with a battalion of Goorkas or Zoolo Caffres or "unspeakable Turks."

If I have dwelt on this subject so long, Mr. Editor, it is because I think it can be put a stop to by the Government. A general order crushed out Orangism in the British army. Why cannot the same thing be done in Canada? We have a Minister of Militia; let his attention be called to this dreadful evil, and if he refuse to act, then let us form Catholic battalions. Why should we not? Have not Irish, Scotch and English Catholics followed the British flag in its tour round the world, and have they not given their lives for the cause it represents? Are we less loyal than the Orangemen?

I hear rumors of an Irish Catholic volunteer battalion about being organized in Montreal. I hope this is so, but I trust we are not going to stop at one. I would respectfully suggest that a deputation of Catholics wait upon the Minister of Militia and draw his attention to the state of the volunteers. If he choose to move for their reorganization, well and good—the Catholics cannot join them without fear of being refused; and if he does not, he can scarcely refuse the privilege of forming corps of our own.

Yours faithfully, SOUTHERMAN.

Montreal, July 18, 1878.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EVENING POST.

Sir,—At a regular meeting of the above Society, held in their hall, on Thursday evening, July 11th, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

Resolved, That while we submissively bow to the will of Almighty God, who moves in a mysterious way his own wonders to perform, nevertheless, we feel deeply express our belief that this Society has sustained a deep loss, the Catholic Church a true member, and society one who was ever ready to extend a helping hand to those in need; he is gone, yet we cannot but express our profound sorrow for one who has endeared himself to this organization. And be it

Resolved, That as a Society, we tender our sympathetic condolence to the sorrowing surviving relations of our departed friend, assuring them that the mutual friendship that existed between this Society and the deceased in his lifetime, will ever remain green in our memories: And be it further

Resolved, That as an earnest expression of our respect and esteem to our late friend, we attend his funeral in a body; that a copy of this preamble and resolutions be presented in the name of this Society to the family of the deceased, and that the same be published in the TRUE WITNESS of Montreal, the Tribune and Irish Canadian of Toronto, and the Free Press and Advocate of this city.

JAMES SPEARMAN, EDITOR.

LONDON, JULY 12th, 1878.

FIVE MINUTE SERMONS FOR EARLY MASSES.

THE PAULIST FATHERS.

Preached in their Church of St. Paul the Apostle, Fifty-Ninth St. and Sixth Ave., New York.

[COPYRIGHT.]

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST.

GOSPEL.—St. Matt. v. 20-24.

EPITHE.—1 St. Peter, iii. 8-15.

"He that will love life and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil."

The words of the blessed Apostle St. Peter teach us that the good, peaceable man is the happiest—that God rewards a kind heart even in this life. Yes, the kindly-spoken man is a happy man. He has no quarrels on his hands. You cannot make him quarrel. Though he be strong and active, yet he is incapable of using his strength to injure his neighbor. Say a sharp, bitter thing to him, and, instead of feeling insulted, he will laugh it off, and tell you to be good natured, or will act as if he had offended you. And the good, peaceable man is no slenderer or tale bearer. When he hears anything to his neighbor's detriment he is sorry; he buries it in his kind heart, and tries to forget it. If his friends quarrel among themselves, he is the ready and successful peacemaker. If death, sickness, or misfortune of any kind afflicts his neighbor, he is the kind and skillful comforter. What do people think of such a man? Everybody loves him. And is not that happiness? Why, if a dog loves you it gives you joy. And the affection of many friends makes this a paradise. So the good, peaceable man has that element of a lovey-life and good days.

I need not say that the good, peaceable man is happy in his family. How children love a kind parent! How they enjoy home when he is there, with his happy laugh and innocent jest. His wife is proud of that husband, and blesses God for such a father for her little ones. There is no bickering, jealousy or ill-will in that home, but clarity and joy the whole year round.

& Co., St. Catharines; Skinner, Campbell & Co., St. Catharines; McCameron & Co.; Worthington & Co.

Rumor hath it that three of those teams have formed a combination such as is known in the States as a "Grand freeze out," with the object of playing into each other's hands in such a way that the approval of the Chairman being secured, they would be enabled to shut off all chances of a fair decision. It remains to be seen whether the confidence which is felt in the Commission is misplaced or not; they must not be swayed from the strict path of duty; a fair honest award is looked for. The lowest competent tender is the one to accept; any ulterior grant will only end disastrously as the first.

Yours &c., QUEBEC.

Quebec, July 18th, 1878.

I. C. B. U.

BRANCHE NO. 8 LONDON, ONT.

At a regular meeting of the above Society, held in their hall, on Thursday evening, July 11th, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:—

Resolved, By a mysterious visitation of Divine Providence, Mr. Andrew O'Mara, father of the President of this Society, has been removed from our midst, we deem it a duty we owe to the respect of his memory, to therefore

Resolved,—That while we submissively bow to the will of Almighty God, who moves in a mysterious way his own wonders to perform, nevertheless, we feel deeply express our belief that this Society has sustained a deep loss, the Catholic Church a true member, and society one who was ever ready to extend a helping hand to those in need; he is gone, yet we cannot but express our profound sorrow for one who has endeared himself to this organization. And be it

Resolved, That as a Society, we tender our sympathetic condolence to the sorrowing surviving relations of our departed friend, assuring them that the mutual friendship that existed between this Society and the deceased in his lifetime, will ever remain green in our memories: And be it further

Resolved, That as an earnest expression of our respect and esteem to our late friend, we attend his funeral in a body; that a copy of this preamble and resolutions be presented in the name of this Society to the family of the deceased, and that the same be published in the TRUE WITNESS of Montreal, the Tribune and Irish Canadian of Toronto, and the Free Press and Advocate of this city.

JAMES SPEARMAN, EDITOR.

LONDON, JULY 12th, 1878.

FIVE MINUTE SERMONS FOR EARLY MASSES.

THE PAULIST FATHERS.

Preached in their Church of St. Paul the Apostle, Fifty-Ninth St. and Sixth Ave., New York.

[COPYRIGHT.]

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER PENTECOST.

GOSPEL.—St. Matt. v. 20-24.

EPITHE.—1 St. Peter, iii. 8-15.

"He that will love life and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil."

The words of the blessed Apostle St. Peter teach us that the good, peaceable man is the happiest—that God rewards a kind heart even in this life. Yes, the kindly-spoken man is a happy man. He has no quarrels on his hands. You cannot make him quarrel. Though he be strong and active, yet he is incapable of using his strength to injure his neighbor. Say a sharp, bitter thing to him, and, instead of feeling insulted, he will laugh it off, and tell you to be good natured, or will act as if he had offended you. And the good, peaceable man is no slenderer or tale bearer. When he hears anything to his neighbor's detriment he is sorry; he buries it in his kind heart, and tries to forget it. If his friends quarrel among themselves, he is the ready and successful peacemaker. If death, sickness, or misfortune of any kind afflicts his neighbor, he is the kind and skillful