

Let us now compare the evidence adduced in both cases. In Galway, the clergy, at a meeting held at Athenry, had passed resolutions in favor of Captain Nolan, who had requested the Reverend Mr. Lavelle to call that meeting. Later on, a great number of priests preached violent sermons in different parts of the county against Captain Trench. Not only did judge Keogh, see in this a general system of intimidation, but he was also of opinion that Captain Nolan, by his letter to Reverend Mr. Lavelle, was the instigator of that intimidation, that he should be held personally responsible for it, and in consequence disqualified him. What do we find in the present case? Mr. Onésimé Gauthier tenders the candidature to Mr. Langevin. Mr. Langevin says he will not come forward unless he has the assurance of the support of the clergy. Mr. Gauthier goes in to the county; a meeting of the *curés* 10 takes place at Bay St. Paul, at the residence of Mr. Sirois, who was the presiding spirit of this plot against the liberty of the electors, and rightly so to, because he had sufficient violence of character to communicate the same to the most peaceable clergymen of the county. A resolution is there passed to the effect that they would support Mr. Langevin. Mr. Gauthier returns to Quebec, and informs Mr. Langevin of what has taken place. Mr. Langevin, now being certain of his election, through this organisation, accepts the candidature. He declares every where that he is the candidate of the clergy, that the electors must obey their clergy, and represents Mr. Tremblay and his party as dangerous to religion. To prove this he even goes so far as to read a letter which his brother, His Lordship the Bishop of Rimouski, has taken the trouble to write to him, denouncing Mr. Tremblay and the liberal party. The election was scarcely begun when violent denunciations of Mr. Tremblay and his party were spread broad cast in several parishes. They say everywhere that it is a sin to vote for Mr. Tremblay, and that all the liberals will be damned. In the second week before the end of a meeting held at Hyppolite Tremblay's house, at St. Hilario, he "clergy seem to be in his favor, but that it would be better if they would speak more clearly." Mr. Langevin answers Jules Tremblay, who has made this remark, that *the hopes, next Sunday it will be said more explicitly, ce sera plus clair, il l'espère, le dimanche suivant.* The following Sunday, which was the last before the polling, curé Sirois preached that terrible sermon to which we have referred, against Mr. Tremblay and his party, and after which, as Perron tells 30 us, *the people returned to their homes in sadness.* Reverend Mr. Langlais, on that Sunday also asked his parishioners, "if they would side with Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel, or with the Pope," and a riot took place at the church door, after his discourse. On that Sunday also, Reverend Mr. Fafard, of St. Urbain, insulted Mr. Tremblay's supporters and called their leader an *escaped prisoner*, (*un échappé de prison*). On this same Sunday, Reverend Mr. Roy, of St. Irénée, said only a low mass because Mr. Langevin had been ill received on the previous Sunday, and threatened to abandon the place and leave the parish without a priest if the like should occur again. On that day also, Reverend Messrs. W. Tremblay and Cinq-Mars told their parishioners that it was a sin to vote for Mr. Tremblay.

The electors were mad with fear, those only voted for Mr. Tremblay, who were sufficiently informed to know that the curés were wrong, or who were such determined partisans 40 that they would vote for him even at the risk of committing a mortal sin, of endangering the existence of religion and the salvation of their souls. The organisation is so complete and so powerful, that Revd. Mr. Doucet, the curé of the parish where Mr. Tremblay resides, a prudent priest and up to that time entirely devoted to his ecclesiastical duties, who had never interfered in politics, who esteems Mr. Tremblay, and considers him a man worthy