

So long as the Union Jack flies over Quebec those of English speech and descent are the heirs of all the rights of Britons and are cowards when they become beholden to the majority for the enjoyment of the least of those rights. The sycophants who fawn on that majority for the sake of gain or office, who are effusive in their expressions of gratitude to that majority, have forfeited their title to be called Britons, for they are traitors to that glorious heritage of freedom won by generations of haters of despotism, whether secular or clerical. When the flag of England is lowered, when it is replaced by that of the Sacred Heart or of St. Jean Baptiste, Bourassa and Lavergne may point with complacent vanity to Protestants not being compelled to send their children to be educated by nuns and brothers, and to provision being made for the use of the English language in court and legislature, but not till then. So long as the Province of Quebec is part and parcel of the British Empire, those who are loyal to that Empire will spurn the idea of being beggars for what is theirs by inheritance.

THE HYPOCRITICAL CLAIMS OF THE NATIONAL- ALISTS.

The utterances of the Nationalists in taking credit to themselves as being, in their treatment of the English minority, models of toleration and generosity, are galling. What is the main claim of their church? Is it not, that it, and it alone, is right? Is that tolerance? Does their church not teach that all who have not been baptized in it are lost souls? When a Protestant desires to become a Catholic, is he not required to say:

"I condemn, reject, and solemnly avow as false all the heresies of whatever character, which have been condemned, rejected, and solemnly declared as false by the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church."

Where is the broad-mindedness in this pledge? Or again, who can be a freeman who repeats after the priest: