

# The Catholic Record.

"CHRISTIANUS MIHI NOMEN EST, CATHOLICUS VERO COGNOMEN."—"CHRISTIAN IS MY NAME, BUT CATHOLIC MY SURNAME."—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME 8.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, MAY 15, 1886

NO. 396.

**NICHOLAS WILSON & CO.**  
126 Dundas Street,  
Tailors and Gents' Furnishers.  
**FINE AND MEDIUM WOOLLENS A SPECIALTY.**  
INSPECTION INVITED.

## THE HOME RULE DEBATE.

Continued from third page.  
before and after he entered public life. He regretted that the last speaker would not accept the resolutions of his hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue. In his opinion they were more dignified than the others. He was the son of an Irishman and his mother was an Irishwoman, and his wish had always been that we could arrive at the day when we could say God save Ireland, and God save the Queen. He did not wish to disparage the motives of the Leader of the Opposition, but there was more suspicion attached to his conduct than to that of the hon. gentleman, the Minister of Inland Revenue. The fact that the motion was made by the Leader of the Opposition when going into supply showed a sign of his insincerity. Then there was something suspicious about the fact that the Leader of the Opposition should have not first taken the Leader of the French Canadians in that House into his confidence, without which it would have been difficult to carry any resolution for Home Rule. The question now was whether or not such a resolution would be to the advantage of Ireland. It was impossible to do anything more formidable than was done in 1882, and therefore it would be better to let that stand as it was, for the fear that something less might be put in its stead. Only one Irish association in this country ever spoke on the matter. Not one man or one organization in this country ever approached him on the subject. He failed to see in any of the Catholic papers of the Dominion anything which would justify the leader of the Opposition in placing such a resolution before the House. These papers were not urging for a measure of Home Rule. In fact, Mr. Blake's course was disapproved of by all the people of Canada. He read appreciatively from a newspaper editorial to the effect that the Queen had nothing to do with the matter, it was Mr. Gladstone to whom they ought to address themselves. If he (Mr. Curran) had come forward and moved an address to the Queen he would be denounced by all the Irishmen in Canada, and told that he should have moved congratulations to Mr. Gladstone. In view of the mubbling which the Canadian people got in the Kimberley despatch it would not be judicious to put ourselves in the same position again. All were aware of that answer, and would it not look strange to go and address the Queen under such circumstances? He trusted the leader of the Opposition would support the resolution of the Minister of Inland Revenue, notwithstanding what the member for West Elgin had said. It was a question of political politics in England, and if Mr. Gladstone would not give Ireland Home Rule, then the Tories would out-trump the Liberals.

Mr. McMullen, on rising, was received with groans from the Government side. He said—"I don't think it is right that on such an occasion as this least any Irishman should be received with groans on the floor of this House. (Opposition cheers.) I am as true an Irishman as any who sit in this Chamber. I was born on the Ould Sod, and lived there for a good many years. I have visited the old land again and travelled through it. I love the green hills of Old Ireland, and I have the noble memories of the land of my birth. When I rise to present to the best of my humble ability the arguments in support of the views I take, I think I am entitled to a fair hearing." Continuing, he said he deplored the course the hon. gentleman opposite had deemed it their duty to take on this occasion. He would have been glad had the question before the House been treated by gentlemen opposite in the spirit in which it was submitted by the mover of the resolution. He was quite sure the leader of the Opposition took the stand he did because he was honestly desirous of strengthening the hands of Mr. Gladstone in the herculean task he had undertaken. Had the resolution emanated from their own side, hon. gentlemen opposite would have supported it, and had their leader offered it they would have raised their voices to glorify the resolution and its mover, but because the leader of the Opposition had presented it, after waiting for weeks, aye, months, for the gentlemen opposite to do so, they opposed it. There was a majority on the other side. If they desired to take action in this matter, why had they not done so in all the time they had since the session opened? Was it because they considered it of so little moment as to be unworthy of their attention? The member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) said that a meeting of Irish men had been called to consider the matter, and every Irishman in the Commons and Senate was invited. He (Mr. McMullen) claimed to be an Irishman, and he was not invited. He wondered if the leader of the Opposition had been told anything about it, or if he was present.

Mr. Curran—I said Irish Catholic members.  
Mr. McMullen—I regret more than I can say that the hon. gentleman took this narrow view of the question. I would like to know if the resolution of

1882 was carried by Irish Catholics in this House? (Loud cheers.) I would like to know if men of all creeds on this side of the House and on the other did not support it? But we can easily conceive of the object aimed at by the hon. gentleman and his friends in this matter. No doubts they wanted to find what was the chance of carrying a resolution by their own supporters, and what would be the effect politically. They came to the conclusion that they could make everything more harmonious among themselves by having the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Costigan) send a despatch in the name of the Irishman of Canada, though how he got the authority to do that it would be hard to say. They fenced the question for two months, but now it is brought before them squarely, and they find that their only object must be to attempt to prevent the leader of the Opposition from reaping the glory of having offered this resolution. In order to do that the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Costigan) prepared and presented his amendment. He (Mr. McMullen) was quite sure that if Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell were consulted as to which resolution should be put they would choose that of the leader of the Opposition. That would best suit the noble purpose which the Premier of England had in view. Canada had had a little experience regarding Home Rule, and could speak with authority of that experience. They all knew the difficulties which arose in the old Province of Canada and how Confederation, introducing the Federal system, had allayed those difficulties. Canada had been spending millions of money to induce people from the Old Country to come and settle amongst us. It had not been for the dislike of British rule in the absence of a fair measure of local self-control, many Irishmen, who would have come to Canada under the existing system, shunned the British colonies. Canada had this direct and important interest in securing Home Rule for Ireland, and so allaying the feeling in Ireland, against British authority. The member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) had impugned the sincerity of the leader of the Opposition, but fair minded men would see in the resolution and in the speech supporting it a fair and honest attempt to win the support of this House for those who were seeking to gain Home Rule for Ireland. The hon. gentleman had also referred to the position of the *Globe* and *Mail*. Those who read those papers would know that the *Globe* was the consistent advocate of Home Rule. The *Mail* had fought the question until recently, when it came out against it. Notwithstanding the effort of gentlemen opposite to kill the resolution and deprive the leader of the Opposition of the credit he deserved, people would understand the situation, and even if the resolution would not be carried they would give credit to the man who had submitted it to the House. (Cheers.) Doubtless having heard from two Irishmen on the opposite side—the member for East Hastings (Mr. White) was an Irishman (cheers) as also the member for Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy), and others (hear, hear and laughter)—gentlemen who had spoken were very enthusiastic in favor of Home Rule. So much did they love the great cause of Home Rule that they feared that this resolution would carry, and they must carve it in their cheese-paring way in order to make it presentable. The Leader of the Opposition was charged with insincerity and unfairness in this matter. Had he presented his resolution early in the session, before gentlemen opposite had a chance to consider the matter, there might have been something in this charge, but they had not given weeks in Parliament and had not given a hint that they intended to do anything to sustain Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell in the noble work they were doing.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

## EVENING SESSION.

Mr. McMullen endeavored to show the reason why the Government prevented the resolutions of the Leader of the Opposition from going to the House. It was extraordinary, after what he occurred in Ireland, that we were only now going to adhere to what had been done in 1882. After our own experience since that time it was necessary that we should go further. Were the statements of Englishmen further advanced since 1882? Mr. Gladstone was not of the same mind as he was in 1882. He was sorry to think that the little political bitterness which characterized the actions of gentlemen opposite could not be kept out of this important matter, which, if carried, would go far to help Mr. Gladstone in his difficulty. It might be expected that we would fight out our own questions on political lines, but in dealing with such an important question it was unworthy to do so. As an Irishman he would do anything he could to promote this matter, and lay aside all political differences for the time. Believing as he did that Home Rule was for the interest and welfare of Ireland, he would move an amendment to the amendment that the following be added to the original resolution after the word "adhesion":—And that this House is confirmed and strengthened by the events which have occurred since the passage of the said address, in its conviction that the true interests of Ireland and the rest of the Empire will be served in the highest degree by the grant of Home Rule to Ireland. (Cheers.)

Mr. Burns (Irish Catholic) opposed Mr. McMullen's amendment but at the same time expressed himself eager for Ireland's liberation from thralldom.  
Mr. O'Brien (Orange Tory) viewed with the greatest alarm the granting of Home Rule to Ireland.

Ireland was poor enough, but it would be worse if Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule

Bill passed, and would put that country in the hands of Mr. Parnell and his 86 men. In conclusion he said—"I will vote for the amendment proposed by the Hon. Mr. Costigan—(Hear, hear, from the Liberals.) Hold on until I finish my sentence. I will vote for the amendment of the Minister of Inland Revenue, because of the three I believe it will have the least effect." (Loud laughter.)  
Mr. Landerkin (Liberal) thought that in the interest of Canada and of the Empire, they should hold up Mr. Gladstone's hands in his noble effort to solve this difficult problem.  
Mr. Oron declared that in his opinion the scheme of Mr. Gladstone was one of the most important of the day, giving Ireland no control of their customs and revenue. One of the great difficulties of Ireland was that her people were almost wholly agricultural, whereas manufacturers must be encouraged if Ireland was to prosper. He had no fear the Protestant ministry would be oppressed by those of the minority. The position of gentlemen opposite was exceedingly strange one. An amendment proposed by one to his leader's resolution, meaning thereby, if he meant anything, that his leader was insincere, and another found fault with the resolution his leader presented.

Mr. MacNeill (Orange Tory) made a violent speech in favor of the Costigan amendment.  
Mr. Hackett (Irish Catholic) declared that now Mr. Gladstone, not from any high motives, or from any love of the Irish people, but from motives of political expediency, introduced the Home Rule measure. He believed the House should rest upon its record of 1882, believing that any other course would injure the cause of Home Rule.  
Mr. Allen (Liberal) rejoiced that one statesman had had courage and patriotism enough to introduce a measure of Home Rule. It was a gross slander to say that Irishmen were not able to govern themselves. They had taken the foremost position in many parts of the Empire. He had learned with satisfaction that the member for Centre Montreal (Mr. Curran) had proposed a resolution on this subject, and was disappointed when he found he had abandoned the idea. At a later period he learned that the Minister of Inland Revenue was going to introduce such a resolution, and was again disappointed. He referred to the result of the recent election in Ireland, which showed that Ireland was the consistent advocate of Home Rule, and that the majority of the House were overwhelmingly in favor of Home Rule.  
Mr. Wallace, of York, (Orange Tory) followed in opposition to the MacNeill and in favor of the Costigan amendment.

Mr. Blake, in a masterly speech, then summed up the argument. He said that the Minister of Inland Revenue had treated this as an Irish Catholic question, as the member for Montreal treated it. The latter gentleman spoke of the meeting to which the Irish Catholic members of Parliament were invited. Did the hon. gentleman invite Senator Power or Senator Scott? No, they confined it then to the Irish Tory Catholics, and this Irish Tory Catholic clique met and decided to decide as to the course this House should take. (Cheers.) If they are to be any calculated to prejudice the cause it is this treatment of it by gentlemen opposite as an Irish Catholic question, as if it was not a wide question in which all lovers of liberty throughout the world might take an interest. (Cheers.) What is the influence that will be drawn? The course of Home Rule will say—in 1882 the Canadian Parliament unanimously in the Commons, and by a very large majority in the Senate, passed a resolution in favor of Home Rule. In 1886 a Minister of the Crown was afraid to move a resolution in favour of Home Rule, (hear, hear) and he sends for sooth, his own cable to Mr. Parnell, which is to be equivalent to the voice of the Commons (Hear, hear.) No, it could not be equivalent. He said it would be dangerous for him to move again, because there would be some dissent. He said also that there would be a difficulty since 1882. We are not now tending our advice to Her Majesty's Ministers. We are professing simply to encourage Her Majesty's Ministers in the course which they have declared they are pursuing. (Applause.) We are not offering advice; we are giving our moral force and the support of this House to aid them in the course they are pursuing. (Hear, hear.) I say that we were right in 1882 in averring that the Commons of Canada had the right, and that it was their duty respectfully to address our Queen, the Queen of the Empire, and tender our loyal suggestions and opinions upon a question of interest to the Empire, and to us as citizens of the Empire, and it is as a Canadian I hope that no hon. member of the House will declare to-day that we were not right in doing that because forsooth, a Colonial Secretary has expressed about the matter. Now that does not appear to be a very serious question, because he has found another form which gets rid of that (hear, hear), so that it could not have been that which prevented him from prompt action unless we assume that his zeal and love for the Irish cause was not so potent to find out what, under the spur of necessity, he has since ascertained. (Cheers.) We are not in circumstances are changed a different opinion. I hope that we are not going to abrogate that right as citizens of the Empire. I say that our most dignified course is to pass on and when the occasion again arises, as it has now arisen, to say, "We abide by the views which we expressed in 1882, which you did not then think fit to adopt, but which you have since adopted." (Cheers.) The occasion has arisen more fortunately than could have been conjectured for this country to reassert in a dignified manner

its right to address its sentiments upon this important subject with the certainty that at this time that right will not be repudiated but gratefully acknowledged. (Cheers.) The most dignified course is for us to reassert that opinion without any reference to Earl Kimberley's answer, but knowing that we have the right to speak to our Queen. (Cheers.) The hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) is content that we should express our views, although in an abhorrent fashion. I say our most dignified course is once again in a constitutional manner to approach Her Majesty to re-echo and reassert our sentiments, with such variation as the case may require, but if we do not choose to proceed by an address; if we say that because we have been told formerly that we ought not to proceed by address, I hope that we have not fallen so low as to formally record upon our journals the opinion that we ought not to go for that reason. (Cheers.) If the hon. gentleman's amendment is passed we shall say that because Earl Kimberley chose to make this reply four years ago, therefore we do not choose to address the Queen at all cases and all emergencies in which Imperial interests may be concerned. (Hear, hear.) We will be agreeing in a formal manner to the view of Earl Kimberley, acting upon that view, declaring that he was right, and we were wrong. We shall be closing the door upon ourselves by our own resolution from at any future time voting an honorable address to the Crown upon an Imperial question. I turn to the substance of the hon. gentleman's amendment. It is a suspicious amendment. It ought to make the hon. gentleman himself suspicious that his resolution finds so much favor with the enemies of Home Rule. (Cheers.) The hon. member for Muskoka (Mr. O'Brien), with that frankness which commends him to the confidence of this House—(hear, hear)—told us that he would vote for the amendment of the Minister of Inland Revenue, because it would do the least harm. (Cheers and laughter.) Let me make the proper alteration of that phrase, if we are to put it in the mouth of a friend of Home Rule, and say that we choose to vote for the other two resolutions because they will do greater good to the cause of Home Rule. (Cheers.) The hon. member for Muskoka does not approve of the resolution of the Minister of Inland Revenue—colorless as it is, pallid as it is, vague as it is, built up to it is, so far as possible, the views of the hon. gentleman for Muskoka (laughter)—but he is prepared to support it because it does the least harm. (Laughter.) The hon. gentleman has presented to him three different kinds of noxious drugs. He smells them, he sips them a little. (Laughter.) He throws down one, then another, and then with a very face he gulps down the third. (Great laughter.) These are the statements of the enemies of Home Rule. As to these resolutions, what should be the sentiment of the friends of Home Rule? I am very sorry, for the sake of the cause of Home Rule, that the hon. gentleman, in the attempt to please three or four different parties, has proposed a resolution which, by comparison, will seem to be less favourable to the cause than I could have desired. (Hear, hear.) I am afraid that in the attempt to combine the heterogeneous substances of which the hon. gentleman's following is composed (laughter) he should have given us a resolution which has produced these Muskoka. (Cheers.) The hon. member for Montreal (Mr. Curran) blames us for not having consulted the Irish members on the other side of the House. Well now, they for a long time have had their little clique, talking over this matter trying to decide what should be done. Did they consult me? Had I not helped them before? (Cheers.) Had I not done my best to help the cause to produce a happy result on a former occasion? (Cheers.) However, I do not complain of their not consulting me, but if it is to be made a ground of complaint against me that I did not consult them I have as good a cause for complaint that they did not consult me before deciding that it would be too dangerous to move a Home Rule resolution. The hon. Minister was good enough to recognize me once before. He did not bring me to the committee, and he gave his reason. They decided to bring all the Irishmen in the House except the First Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. (Laughter.) No, I heard that seven cities claim the birth of the First Minister who is said to be a Scotchman.

The hon. gentleman concluded as follows:  
We are asked to pronounce in favor of the second reading of the Bill, as affirming the principle of Home Rule for Ireland. I say that the course I have proposed is the best, most practicable, most reasonable step toward that end, and that step we are asked to set aside in favor of the pallid, colorless, vague and complicated resolution of the Minister of Inland Revenue which is acceptable to those hon. gentlemen who do not like Home Rule because it is a little less likely to promote Home Rule. The hon. gentleman for West York accuses me of toadying to Mr. Gladstone, because I have not moved an address to Mr. Gladstone, because I have not expressed my sympathy with that great statesman, because that instead of proposing to address him I propose to address the Throne. For these reasons I am told I am toadying to Mr. Gladstone. When in 1882 I ventured to express my opinion that the difficulties which Mr. Gladstone had pointed out did not excite him from dealing with the question, that he was not excused by the fact that the Home Ruler who had

not the power to pass it, and had not formulated his scheme for Home Rule, and that it was he who, having the power, should have formed such a scheme, the First Minister criticised me very severely and was very anxious that the Hansard containing my speech should be delayed lest it should prejudice Mr. Gladstone against the resolution. Now I am accused of toadying to Mr. Gladstone. (Cheers and laughter.) I believe that it is extremely unfortunate that the proposals of the hon. gentleman as to agreeing to a motion were not carried out. I believe it would be very much better had that been done. As it was not to be done, we have to settle this question on the floor of the House, the usual way. I consider my motion preferable to the amendment of the Minister for the reason I have stated. I consider the amendment of the member for West Elgin as preferable to mine, and I shall vote for that amendment. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. Thompson opposed and Messrs. Courson and Patterson, Brant, supported the MacMullen amendment.  
A vote was then taken on Mr. McMullen's amendment to the amendment, which was lost, Yeas, 60; Nays, 118.  
Yeas—Messrs. Allen, Amyot, Armstrong, Anger, Bain (Westworth), Bechard, Bergeron, Bernier, Bourassa, Burpee, Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Middlesex), Campbell (Renfrew), Cartwright, Casey, Casgrain, Cook, Courson, Davies, Desaulniers (Maskinonge), Desjardins, Dupont, Fairbank, Fisher, Forbes, Giguat, Gilmour, Glen, Guay, Gunn, Harley, Holton, Innes, Irvine, Jackson, King, Kirk, Landerkin, McIntyre, McMillan, Mill Mitchell, Mulock, Paterson (Brant), Platt, Ray, Rinfret, Scrivner, Somerville (Brant), Somerville (Bruce), Springer, Sutherland (Oxford), Trow, Vail, Watson, Weldon, Wilson, Wright, Yoo—60.

Nays—Messrs. Abbott, Allison, Bain (Southwest), Baker (Missisquoi), Baker (Sutcliffe), Barker, Barnard, Beatty, Bell, Bennett, Boudreau, Bourbeau, Bowell, Bryson, Burnham, Burns, Cameron (Inverness), Cameron (Victoria), Campbell (Victoria), Carling, Caron, Cimon, Cochrane, Costigan, Coughlin, Curran, Cuthbert, Daly, Droust, Dawson, Desaulniers (St. Maurice), Dickinson, Dodd, Dugas, Dundas, Everett, Farrow, Ferguson (Leeds and Grenville), Ferguson (Welland), Fortin, Foster, Gaudet, Girouard, Gordon, Grandbois, Gribault, Guillet, Hackett, Haggart, Hall, Hay, Hesson, Hickey, Homer, Hannah, Jamieson, Jenkins, Kaulbach, Kilvert, Kinley, Kranz, Landro, Landry, [Kent], Landry, [Montmagny], Langevin, Lussac, Macdonald (King), Macdonald (St. John), Mackintosh, Macmaster, Macmillan (Middlesex), McMillan (Vaudreuil), McCallum, McCarty, McDougall (Cape Breton), McGreevy, McLaughlin, McNeill, Messer, Moffat, Montclair, O'Brien, Orton, Oulmet, Paine, Paterson (Essex), Pinsonneault, Prayn, Red, Riopel, Robertson (Hamilton), Robertson (Hastings), Royal, Rykert, Scott, Shakespeare, Small, Sproule, Stairs, Tasse, Taylor, Temple, Thompson (Antigonish), Townsend, Tupper, Tyrwhitt, Vallin, Vanasse, Wallace (Alber), Wallace (York), Ward, White (Cardwell), White (Hastings), White (Renfrew), Wigle, Wood (Brockville), Wood (Westmoreland)—118.

The Costigan amendment was then carried by a vote of 117 to 61. Mr. Blake then moved that the resolutions as amended be sent to Mr. Gladstone, a proposition that met with government opposition. After much wrangling Mr. Mills moved to send the resolution to Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell, upon which the House divided. Yeas 69, nays 87.

Yeas—Allen, Amyot, Armstrong, Bain (Westworth), Bechard, Bergeron, Blake, Bourassa, Bourbeau, Bura, Burpee, Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Middlesex), Campbell (Renfrew), Cartwright, Casey, Casgrain, Cook, Costigan, Coughlin, Curran, Daly, Davies, Dodd, Dupont, Fairbank, Fisher, Forbes, Giguat, Gilmour, Girouard, Glen, Guay, Gribault, Gunn, Hackett, Harley, Holton, Hurteau, Innes, Irvine, Jackson, King, Kirk, Landerkin, McMullen, Messer, Mills, Moffat, Montclair, O'Brien, Orton, Oulmet, Paine, Paterson (Essex), Pinsonneault, Prayn, Red, Riopel, Robertson (Hamilton), Robertson (Hastings), Rykert, Scott, Shakespeare, Small, Sproule, Stairs, Tasse, Taylor, Temple, Thompson (Antigonish), Townsend, Tupper, Tyrwhitt, Vallin, Vanasse, Wallace (Alber), Wallace (York), Ward, White (Cardwell), White (Hastings), White (Renfrew), Wigle, Wood (Brockville), Wood (Westmoreland)—87.

Mr. Thompson then moved that the resolution be transmitted to the High Commissioner for Canada. (Uproarious laughter, interrupting the reading of the motion.) When they had heard what he had to say gentlemen opposite might not be so well pleased. He moved that the resolution be transmitted to the high commissioner for Canada for the information of the members of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom.  
Mr. Cook—I may say for the information of the Minister of Justice (Mr.

Thompson) that the High Commissioner is one of the gentlemen who have no confidence in the breed.

This motion was finally carried by a vote of 80 to 70, and the Costigan amendment as considered finally carried by 140 to 6.

## FASHIONABLE WEDDING.

AN INTERESTING MARRIAGE CEREMONY IN ST. PATRICK'S CHURCH THIS MORNING.

The marriage of Capt. D. C. Forrester Bliss, of the Indian department, to Miss Bertha Costigan, youngest daughter of the Hon. John Costigan, Minister of Inland Revenue, was celebrated at St. Patrick's church this morning, the officiating clergyman being the Rev. M. J. Wielan, parish priest, assisted by the Rev. Father Campeau, of the Baseline. The groom was supported by his brother, Mr. Bliss, while the bridesmaid was Miss Fanny Linsley, daughter of Mr. Linsley, general manager C. A. railway. The sacred edifice was very largely filled, the great proportion of the spectators being ladies. After mass the wedding party drove to the residence of the bride's father where a recherche breakfast was partaken of. The ceremony in the church was entirely devoid of any parade; being a simple, unostentatious affair. At the residence of the bride's father preparations had been in vogue for an early hour, and everything had been done to contribute to the elegance of the occasion. The bride's wedding dress consisted of a beautiful olive brown travelling suit which admirably became her, while Miss Linsley, the bridesmaid, was attired in a native dress which harmonized well with the bride's suit. The display of presents was magnificent and varied, being ornamental, costly and useful. The following is the list: A silver salver from Mr. Louis A. Teche; silver cut stand, presented by the officers of the Ottawa Field battery to Captain Bliss and bearing an inscription to that effect; silver biscuit basket from Mrs. and Mr. Linsley; gold pin set with pearls from Captain Murray; album and stand from Mr. and Mrs. Kavanagh; card case from Miss Gouin; ebony table from Miss Belford; silver butter knife from Miss Ekine; silver card receiver from Mr. Bliss; silver cigar barrel from Sir Adolphe and Lady Caron; silver card receiver from Mrs. J. A. Gouin's eldest set of rose tint with gold leaf tray from Captain Evans; set of silver spoons from Mrs. Connelly, Mr. Walsh and family; lace box from Mrs. Walker Martin; elegant toilet set from Miss Tim; breakfast cruet from Mr. and Mrs. Catterick; silver and amber salt cellar from Miss O'Kelly; silver sugar bowl from Mrs. Walker; a beautiful lamp with crystal pendants from Mrs. Costigan; amber fruit bowl from Mr. and Mrs. McNamane; handsome Knebel piano from Mr. A. D. Bliss, napkin rings from Miss Bliss, parasol from Mr. Ryan, embroidered covers from Miss Evans, ivory to find fault with him because we have happened to differ on abstract principles; but we cannot help saying his answer to the gentlemen from the St. Patrick's Literary Association will be disappointing and painful to many of his friends. Hit or miss, he would have been more in line with his fellow countrymen if he had accepted the proffered trust. No matter as to its success or failure, he at least would have done his duty, which will now be said he has not done, but left, perhaps, for another to do. We say another, because we see it stated that the St. Patrick's Literary Association intend asking the Hon. Mr. Blake to move their resolutions. We hope that better luck will attend this application, and that the Leader of the Opposition will triumph where the Minister of Inland Revenue saw nothing but disaster.—*Irish Canadian.*

The official of the Indian Affairs department presented Capt. Bliss with a gold watch chain and locket studded with dazzling diamonds.

THE IRISH CANADIAN ON MR. COSTIGAN.  
The hon. gentleman (Mr. Costigan) may safely be trusted as an Irishman who is second to none in his attachment to the Fatherland. O' this he has given ample proofs, and we should not be in a hurry to find fault with him because we have happened to differ on abstract principles; but we cannot help saying his answer to the gentlemen from the St. Patrick's Literary Association will be disappointing and painful to many of his friends. Hit or miss, he would have been more in line with his fellow countrymen if he had accepted the proffered trust. No matter as to its success or failure, he at least would have done his duty, which will now be said he has not done, but left, perhaps, for another to do. We say another, because we see it stated that the St. Patrick's Literary Association intend asking the Hon. Mr. Blake to move their resolutions. We hope that better luck will attend this application, and that the Leader of the Opposition will triumph where the Minister of Inland Revenue saw nothing but disaster.—*Irish Canadian.*

Mr. Thompson then moved that the resolution be transmitted to the High Commissioner for Canada. (Uproarious laughter, interrupting the reading of the motion.) When they had heard what he had to say gentlemen opposite might not be so well pleased. He moved that the resolution be transmitted to the high commissioner for Canada for the information of the members of the House of Commons of the United Kingdom.  
Mr. Cook—I may say for the information of the Minister of Justice (Mr.

## OBITUARY.

We deeply regret to learn of the death of Mrs. McVeigh, of Clonaboy, which took place on the 16th of April. The deceased lady was sister of Mr. M. Cranncian, of Lunan, and two of her sons are members of the Order of the Holy Cross. The funeral took place on the 18th, when the remains were consigned to their last resting place in the cemetery of Bidulph. A solemn Requiem Mass was celebrated by the pastor, Rev. J. Connelly, who also preached a most effective discourse appropriate to the occasion. We extend to the relatives of deceased our heartfelt condolences.