

a man of thirty, and there was life and animation in every movement. There was enthusiasm, too, in all his expressions that was truly wonderful. I was amazed at his power."

THE RECEPTION TO THE PILGRIMS.

In the evening at the hotel a large number of ladies and gentlemen assembled in the parlors fronting Broadway; in the centre of the groups of the Canadian pilgrims seemed unusually prominent. Shortly before eight o'clock the address of welcome of the St. Patrick's National Association of Montreal was delivered to Father Dowd. It read as follows:—

BELoved PASTOR,—In the expressive language of our native land we wish you a "hundred thousand welcomes" back to your anxious and expectant flock. We thank God that He has suffered us once more to proclaim the love we bear you and to lay the humble offering of our reverence at your feet. We approach you with all the recollection of thirty years of happy associations reviving in our memories, and we hail you as our Pastor, our father and friend. Our joy to-day is only measured by our incapacity to express it. We are glad for many reasons. During the earlier days of your voyage the faithful and loving Irish Catholics of Montreal were paralyzed with anxiety for your safety. Not until then did we, perhaps, fully realize how dear you were to us all. We almost mourned your loss and in the first burst of our affliction we feared we would never look upon your like again. The cup of our bitterness appeared to be full indeed. All classes and all creeds shared in our prayers for your safety, and God mercifully heard our supplications. He saved you to lead the Irish Canadian pilgrims to the throne of St. Peter, and enabled you to proclaim their unalterable allegiance to his successor, Pius IX. You returned after fulfilling your eventful and pious mission, and we all wait with keen anxiety to hear from your own lips the record of your pilgrimage. Meanwhile rest satisfied with a welcome back to a people who reverence you, and in whose affections you have secured an imperishable love.

Signed on behalf of the association.

M. C. MULLARKY, President.

RESPONSE OF FATHER DOWD.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT—I will not try to disguise the grateful pleasure, your truly Irish welcome gives me at this moment. Landing here in New York after our long voyage, I am pleased indeed at this demonstration. I cannot tell you how happy it makes me to see even a few of my dear friends once more. That happiness is increased a hundred fold in witnessing, as I now do, the joyous reunion of all of the members of these families who through a strong and generous sentiment of religion, consented to the separation demanded by the obligations of our pilgrimage. God has brought us all safe to land. The accidents and perils of our voyage now are all past and they serve to enhance the pleasure of this moment and to intensify our gratitude to our good God, whose lovingly watched over us. I can well understand the anxiety felt in Montreal still more than elsewhere during our protracted voyage. You had among you husbands and wives whose dear partners and children were exposed to the perils of the ocean and were for a time supposed to have perished. This cruel anxiety, the thought of which was ever present to our minds made us, too, suffer. It was, indeed our chief, if not our only, cause of unhappiness. But, thank God, the peril is over for you and for us and may be easily forgotten in the happiness of this glad meeting. The sympathy evinced everywhere for us has been a real consolation; for it we are more grateful than words can express. The accident to the City of Brussels was not in vain, since it has so plainly established the fact that a spirit of heavenly charity abides among us all, which makes us feel for one another and act toward one another as brethren.

As you expect to hear more of our travels at a later period I shall say no more just now. I can only say I thank you for this new proof of your generous kindness, and pray that God may bless you and your dear families abundantly.

THE BLAKE ACT.

HOW JUSTICE IS ADMINISTERED.

ONE LAW FOR CATHOLICS, ANOTHER FOR PROTESTANTS.

Ever since the rumor of anticipated trouble on the 12th of July was circulated in Montreal the citizens were forcibly reminded of the existence of Blake's Act. To the great majority of the people this piece of legislative enactment was unknown, until it was finally intimated to them that the act in question was passed for the purpose of preventing the carrying of fire arms and other unlawful weapons. Law-abiding citizens were highly pleased with this information, and men of all classes could be heard loudly sounding the praises of the gentleman who was the framers of such a protective law. It was, of course, thought that in the enforcement of the provisions of the Statute and country would be alike ignored, and justice evenly dealt out to all, according to the fair play, the equal expectation of equal rights and fair play, the Catholics have been sadly disappointed. That the act is a salutary one, no person will deny, but it was certainly not to be expected that the interpretation of the law would be altogether one-sided, and that Catholics should be the only people dealt with under the Blake law. That such a fact, however, can be seen from the accounts given by the city papers for some days succeeding the funeral of the Orangeman Hackett wherein particulars are given of the arrest, without warrant or other authority, of a number of Catholics who had revolvers in their possession, the authorities well-knowing at the time that self-protection was necessary on the part of the Catholic citizens owing to insane threats made by "Bully Robinson" and his demonstrative followers.

On the arrest of these Catholics (Roughs according to the Protestant Press) they were brought before the Recorder, and obliged to furnish sufficient security to keep the peace, failing in which they would be obliged to undergo various terms of imprisonment. In addition to this, a man named Sheehan, against whom the act was brought to bear, was sentenced \$50 or 3 months. Certain circumstances have more recently come to light, which show even more partiality than in the preceding instance. Shortly before one o'clock on the morning of the 9th instant, Constable Hottin, of the water police force, was on duty on the canal, and, when near Black's bridge, heard the report of a shot proceeding from the locality. He immediately went in the direction indicated by the sound, and passed over the bridge to Mill street, until near the foundry of Messrs W. P. Bartley & Co. when he discovered a young man lying on the ground, with two others leaning over him. A short distance further the constable espied another man who was approaching the spot. The constable immediately perceived that the man who was lying on the ground was wounded, and with all haste proceeded to the station, not for distant, to notify the sergeant of the occurrence, at the same time taking one of the parties with him and leaving the others in charge of private watchman Furlong and another person who happened to be present. The case having been reported to Sergeant Donohue he proceeded to the spot, and taking in the situation in an instant, conveyed the injured man to the Hospital in a carriage, having previously given in-

structions for the arrest of his companions. On arriving at the hospital the wounded man (whose name is John McCulloch, an important witness in the Hackett shooting case) stated to the doctor, in the presence of Sergeant Donohue, that he had shot himself accidentally, his revolver having discharged while at full-cock in his pants pocket. This would seem to be a deliberate falsehood as both the doctor and police officer examined the pocket in which he stated the revolver had been kept, and found no aperture or hole through which a bullet could have passed. The presumption, therefore, is that while the young man, who were more or less under the influence of liquor, were amusing themselves, in some way only known to themselves, one of them succeeded in shooting McCulloch, accidentally, in all probability, as they were all bosom-friends, in fact all young Britons. The statement made by Thos Kemp, one of the accused, to the police is to the effect that he and his three friends had on the evening in question escorted a brother Briton to his home in Hochelaga. They had delayed on the road at several places for the purpose of partaking of refreshments in the shape of liquor (except himself who is a teetotaler). On reaching the canal, the other three: the wounded man, McCulloch with Robt. McMahon, and Arthur Halliday, playing and making a noise, when Kemp left them and started away saying he was going home. He had not gone more than fifty or sixty yards when he heard the intonation of a pistol shot, and on retracing his steps, found that McCulloch had been wounded. When the three prisoners were brought to the station, Halliday and McMahon each had a revolver, one of the chambers of one of them having been recently discharged. They stated that the arms did not belong to them, but that they had received them from McCulloch after the accident. McCulloch also made the same statement to Sergeant Donohue, in the hospital. The three men were brought before Police Magistrate Brehaut the next morning, when, as it may appear one of the accused was placed in the witness box, and allowed to testify on his own behalf on that of his fellow prisoners. Stranger still, that witness was Kemp, who stated most distinctly that he was a considerable distance in front of his friends when the occurrence took place, and consequently could know nothing whatever of the affair. The question now suggests itself, why did Mr. Brehaut, discharge the accused without first having taken the deposition of the wounded man? Why again did he not invoke the Blake act against these persons, who, illegally and in face of repeated warnings, carried deadly weapons on their person? The public have a right to know something about this matter, and it is time that the Government should take the necessary action for the impartial administration of the law. Had these men been members of the Catholic Union they would probably have been, at the instigation of men of the Sergeant Richardson type, condemned to the full penalty of the law. Why these Orangemen, who are all Grand Trunk employees, carried revolvers is not known. Perhaps McCulloch was rejoicing in anticipation of the reward he hopes to receive for his evidence in the Hackett case, and it may be that his friends constituted themselves his escort, and were giving demonstration of how they would act in case of attack by "Papists," when the shooting took place. Be this as it may the citizens are thoroughly disgusted with the manner in which Mr. Brehaut interprets Blake's Act, and Catholics demand that the working of the act should be general, or that it should be repealed. There is considerable indignation against Police Magistrate Brehaut for having proceeded *ex parte* in the case, without even calling upon the police officers or others who might have been able to testify in the matter. All that Catholics ask is "fair play and no favor" and this they must have.

THE CITY COUNCIL.

THE VOLUNTEERS—SHALL THEY BE PAID?—ALDERMAN LABERGE SPEAKS WHAT HE THINKS—ALDERMAN KENNEDY ON THE ORANGE QUESTION—A STORMY DEBATE—MEETING ADJOURNES—WHAT ALD. DONOVAN THINKS OF THE IMPORTATION &c.

A meeting of the City Council was held in the City Hall on Monday night. His Worship the Hon. Mayor Beaudry in the chair.

There were present, besides his Worship, Aldermen Mercer, Donovan, McCambridge, Holland, Gauthier, Thibault, Rivard, Laberge, Laurent, Genereux, Grenier, Chausse, Robert, Childs, Duhamel, Taylor and Clendinning.

The galleries were densely crowded and great interest was manifested in the proceedings throughout, and frequently marks of approval and disapproval expressed.

After other business had been disposed of, the Mayor read the report of the Finance Committee, to which was appended the opinion of Mr. Roy, relative to the Volunteer claim for services on the 10th of July. The report approved of the claim and requested an appropriation of \$4,167.93 from the Reserve fund.

Ald. Grenier supported the report and moved, seconded by Ald. Childs that it be adopted.

Ald. Laberge and Thibault—No, no.

Ald. Thibault moved in amendment, seconded by Ald. Kennedy that the report be not adopted and that the claim for \$4,167.93 be rejected.

In support of his amendment Ald. Thibault made an able speech, out of which we regret we can only give a small portion. After giving a history of the life of the Prince of Orange, Mr. Thibault said—Now, where is the Hero in all this? Where is the great man? the half-God of Orangism? Where is the reason to perpetuate in this free land of America the bloody souvenir of the Battle of the Boyne near Drogheda? No, sir, no reason can we find, except hatred, fanaticism, revenge and the vilest passions of human nature, stirred up by men without honor, without faith, without brains those fire-brands of discord, who are the servile instruments of hell upon earth.

What have the Orangemen to complain here? Are you not free in the land, of our hopes, of our wealth, of our love and of our honor?

When did the Roman Catholics of this country (or of any country) encroach upon the rights of their fellow-citizens? When and where have we been aggressive in any way? Nay, more, do we not tolerate every day all the insults of fire brand fanatics? Have we not suffered silently the violation of the sacred land of our cemetery by the shameful funeral of the unhappy and excommunicated Guldor? Have we not granted in our province every liberty required and asked for by the Protestants? Have we not supported Protestants in all their just claims? Yes, sir, no one would dare, here or elsewhere, if he not a liar, to deny our liberality, our justice and our love of peace, of concord, and conciliation: concord and conciliation which went so far as to tolerate, nay more, as to pardon the insane ravings of a *Douglas* in his sermon of the 12th July last?

Do you want any more? Take all the advantages you like, but leave us our rights, either civil or religious. We will not allow that you encroach upon them. Bear this in mind—The profanator who dare lay his hand over the altar of the covenant even to protect her, was stricken to death. If after all we desire to have peace, the Orangemen of this country wish to raise the *axe of war*, we are ready to resist it by all legal means which are at our disposal, by the very constitution of our country, by the very laws which were framed, either in England or Canada against traitors and disturbers of the peace, against violators of the laws of the land, who take unlawful oaths, who marched in arms in our peaceful cities,

with menace to the citizens, and disgrace to a country? We will not be surprised to see Irish Catholics opposed to their oppressors or to those who remind them of the souvenir of their defeat, of their harms, of their sufferings, and of their exile. Will we recall the barbarous acts of the gloomy past? If your aim is this tell it to us—better to know it to-day than to-morrow. Look at the speech of Mr. Robinson, at those of Dr. Sweetland, and the remarks of the *Mail* which said that the Orangemen would march next year, whatever may happen. Then, what happen if we will pay? Any citizen could bring an action to recover the amount from aldermen personally, and they should be right in doing so, because it would encroach upon the prerogatives of the people and trespass upon the charter of our city. I will go further and more say that which we cannot pay to have military to protect a Society which is not recognised by the law of the land—and am ready to show that Orangemen are not recognised neither in this Country nor in England. It was for that reason that the Prince of Wales refused to pass under the arch at Kingston. There may be honest citizens who believe in Orangism, but unfortunately for them they are not recognised.

Was it necessary to call the troops on the 10th July last? I say no; and the best proof for it lies in the fact that those troops who went out of the city to accompany the funeral of the poor unfortunate young Hackett. Have we to pay for a military show around a funeral.

Our brave militia cheered all along; it was an ovation, not a mourning.

1. They have violated the Ch. 10 Cons. Statutes of L. Canada against all secret societies except Freemasons.

2. They have violated the law passed in 1872 against illicit oaths.

3. They have violated the law passed at the last Session (the Blake law) against those who carry fire arms, revolvers, etc.

Who will say that the pretended Orangemen coming from Kingston Toronto or elsewhere on the above named occasion were armed at that time? No one! Then they were outlaws or indictable for that offense and now we would pay to protect an illegal assembly of men come for the purpose of disturbing the everlasting peace and concord of all the citizens of our great city. No, I say no. (Great applause.)

Ald. Laurent moved in amendment, seconded by Ald. Robert that the discussion on the adoption of the report be deferred until the next meeting of Council.

Ald. Robert said he did not wish his name to appear as seconder; his name had been used without his consent.

Ald. Rivard seconded the motion in place of Ald. Robert.

Ald. Grenier said it was no use referring the matter back to the committee for they were in favour of it.

Ald. Holland—Those who have fought this battle over before know it is the wisest thing to do to settle this matter without going into court. We were in court before, as your Honour knows, and I don't think there is any use going there again now, and I will explain why it will be wise to settle the claim before it is taken into court. Suppose a row was to commence in the city; suppose we had an uprising of the working classes this winter, and our police were insufficient to quell the riot, what other resort have we then—

Ald. Grenier—I maintain you are out of order, as you are not speaking to the question.

The Mayor—I think it would be better to vote on this question without discussion.

Ald. Grenier—Then postpone.

The Mayor said that as a question of order had been raised he was bound to sustain it.

Ald. Donovan—I would not pay one cent. I am determined to oppose it to the bitter end. I would rather sacrifice \$50,000 than pay for escorting blackguards coming into this city.

Cries of order! order!

Ald. Donovan—That is what I say. I would not pay a cent for escorting blackguards and ruffians. Cries of order! order! from the floor of the house and demonstrations of approval from the gallery.

The Mayor—Men who come here will have to observe order. They can look on and hear, but not make any demonstration.

Ald. Mercer—Mr. Mayor, be used very unparliamentary words—very unparliamentary words and uncalled for—uncalled for, sir.

Ald. Donovan—There was no occasion to call upon the volunteers to escort that procession of blackguards, and those gentlemen who called upon them usurped their powers. (Cries of order!) And for what? Was there any riot? or street row?

There was no riot, sir. There was, unfortunately, a life lost on the 12th July through the indiscretion of the unfortunate young man himself, who went out in the morning with murder in his heart, for he was loaded with bullets and fire arms, and if he got into a mass in the excitement which for months had been maturing through the open insults, and every kind of abuse heaped upon the large majority of citizens, upon their faith, upon what was prized higher, dearer even than life, what have we to do with it if he got into a mass with these excited people. They made a grand display on the 10th. If they had shown what sympathy and sorrow was in their hearts, instead of displaying their regalia and blood stained banners through the streets of our city, and inviting cut throats from other cities, who came down with arms in their hands to murder our citizens, it would have been better. (Cries of order.) After a few remarks that were inaudible to the reporters, the speaker continued—The volunteers it is said were called out to protect them. Protect them! In what? To protect them in insulting and trampling upon our feelings. I say, Mr. Mayor, the citizens of Montreal showed great forbearance. I say further it is a credit that they allowed those scamps—(cries of order) to go out of the city again; it redounds to their credit. But, sir, there was no occasion for a military display, because it had been resolved to let them bury him (Hackett.) I for one regret the occurrence. I took no part nor mixed myself in the matter, but I know the feeling was to let him bury him because it was an unfortunate occurrence. The military, they were not called out by your authority, and we recognize no one but you whilst Chief Magistrate and the citizens agree that you acted wisely in refusing to call out the military. You had enough of police—the city police and water police—and, therefore there was no occasion for a military display. But the occasion was offered them to make on the 10th they intended to make on the 12th, and consequently the military was wanted to protect—whom? the men with murder in their hands, and not to protect the peace of the city, therefore I object to one single dollar being paid. I acknowledge no authority but the chief magistrate, and whenever he deems it expedient or necessary to call out the military to preserve the order of the city, I will, pay any bill that may afterwards be presented for that service. I say it is a bad precedent to establish, and a bad precedent for the finance committee to entertain bills before coming to this council. I say that bill should have come before this council before we were in any way committed, but I hope we have not been committed by the committee. I hope the majority of this council will oppose it, for I say it is a bad precedent to establish for future action, for if it is entertained similar bills will be presented from this time out. If this Council will so far forget itself you will find the military will be called out on all such occasions. But, sir, I assure you that if such is the intention it will imperil the peace and welfare of this city in the future, I say if

we don't put our foot down on these demonstrations in this Catholic city of Montreal its peace and welfare will be ruined. I have lived here many years and have many Protestant friends and I know that it is only a faction that brings trouble amongst us. I know it was not the respectable Protestant party that was the occasion of it for they were opposed to such trouble and turmoil. If we begin to set a precedent such as we never had before, it will be fatal to the peace of the city, and I for one will regret it the longest day I live. I want to put an end to it, therefore I say this Council should repudiate such a bill for such a purpose. In concluding Ald. Donovan called upon the Mayor, in case the money was ordered to be paid to veto it, and notwithstanding the opinion of the Attorney whom he respected very highly, would contribute his share in testing the matter in Court.

The Mayor reminded the Council that the argument was not upon the main motion, but upon the amendment to the amendment.

Ald. Mercer had hoped that the report would have been received, without any discussion at all, and certainly never expected such violent language would have been used. His remarks would not be addressed to the main motion or the amendment, but to the violent remarks of Ald. Donovan with reference to the volunteers. When he calls them ruffians, cut-throats, and blackguards—(cries of order.)

Ald. Donovan—I rise to a point of order. I did not call the volunteers blackguards. I called those blackguards who came from Ottawa and Kingston.

Ald. Laberge—Hear, hear.

Ald. Thibault—Out, out.

Ald. Donovan—I call those men ruffians.

Ald. Mercer—But he said the volunteers were ruffians and blackguards.

Ald. Donovan—No, sir; I did not.

Ald. Mercer—I certainly understood him so.

The Mayor—I think, Alderman Mercer, the explanation of Alderman Donovan, that he did not call the volunteers blackguards, or ruffians, should be accepted.

Ald. Mercer was glad to accept Ald. Donovan's explanation, for there was not a finer body of men than their volunteers, who came from all ranks, creeds and nationalities, and were a body which the city had reason to be proud of. With reference to the magistrates he was glad to have the opportunity of saying that when they called out the volunteers after the Mayor had refused, they were not actuated by nationality or creed. (Hear, hear.) but for the benefit of the city of Montreal. In certain portions of the press they had been charged with being "intolerant" and "fanatics" but nothing said in the press was so strong as the words that had fallen from Ald. Donovan. Speaking of the intolerant character of the men (Magistrates) he would ask who were they? There was Mr. A. W. Ogilvie, the local member whose big heart, generous sympathies, and his liberal feelings had obtained for him, not only a local but provincial reputation, and no one envied the influence he had in the provincial legislature. Then there was Mr. Henshaw, a gentleman who had lived in their midst, and who had never been accused of intolerance before. Then there was their friend Ald. Stephens, whose absence he regretted. He had too much chaff in this room to be called intolerant, and too much liberal feeling to allow of fanaticism. As regards himself, he would not say one word. He had his record for the past, for the future his friends would say whether he was ever actuated by a spirit of intolerance. He desired the Council, and the city at large, to understand that the magistrates, in calling out the volunteers did not consider what the religion of the men in the procession was, but, on the contrary, looked only to what would be of advantage to the city. They knew that the city was responsible for any damage that might be done. Let them look at it of Pittsburgh where a mob had charge of the city for 24 hours, and in that time did \$6,000,000 damage, and that place was only about the same size as Montreal. There were in the vaults of the banks of Montreal millions of dollars, the warehouses were stocked with goods from every clime, and the stores were filled from basement to cellar. Were they to leave these to the mercy of a mob? If they were, it was like throwing a spark into a barrel of gunpowder. This payment of \$4,000 to the Volunteers he considered should be looked upon in the light of insurance.

Alderman Laberge said—He never was present at a discussion, before the Council, which required more delicate handling than that which at present occupied their attention. He was well aware that it was only sufficient for a Catholic to open his mouth on this question in order to be accused of fanaticism, but he rested his conduct on the past, and he would certainly be credited when he said his greatest fault was not fanaticism. He had been taught by his father to speak the truth, and that which he thought was just, no matter on what question. In his opinion there had not been the slightest reason for calling out the Volunteers on the 10th July. A certain number of individuals with dirty faces, and with whom no respectable person could shake hand, had come from Ottawa and other places armed to the teeth to assist at the funeral of Thomas L. Hackett. As foreman of the Jury charged to enquire into the circumstances which had led to the death of Hackett, he had during seven days done all that in him lay to discover the perpetrators of the deed, and when the Jury had had decided to render their verdict they could only find one guilty and that one was Thomas L. Hackett, who left his place in the morning with 60 rounds of ammunition, and a revolver loaded in the seven chambers in his pocket, and having taken care before his departure to leave his property in the keeping of his friends. It had been repeatedly stated during the inquest that deceased had fired the first shot. He (Ald. Laberge) could not do otherwise than approve of the conduct of his Worship the Mayor on the 12th July in not unnecessarily calling out the Volunteers (applause.) He could not understand how it was that intelligent men could endorse the calling out of the Military on the 10th, to assist at the funeral of Hackett. He was aware that the Military had been called out at times, but it was on different occasions and at far different demonstrations from that of the 10th July. He remembered that when the late Sir George Cartier was interred, who though he had a great many political enemies he had, all along the route taken by the funeral cortege friends and enemies, partisans though they might have been, respectfully saluted the remains of the great citizen, the great patriot. But at the funeral of Hackett the persons at the crossings of the streets through which the cortege passed remained silent for Hackett it was the horde imported from Ontario who shouted hurra! I can well believe that Hackett was not the subject of those acclamations and hurrahs, but that there was something behind the curtain, they were evoked by the temporary triumph of the pitiful Orange party who merit the contempt of well disposed Protestants as well as Catholics. People are wrong in accusing the Catholics of fanaticism, above all after the Oka affairs, in which fourteen apostate Indians feloniously burned down the Catholic Church and Presbytery, although the Protestant journals had the audacity to contend it was the work of the priests of the Seminary. I am a Catholic, I am not ashamed to say it even as a Protestant glories in being what he is. Why did they not ask that the Mount Royals (65th battalion) should escort Hackett's funeral? They preferred to have it escorted by two battalions of volunteers, composed almost exclusively of Orangemen, which volunteers on returning from the cemetery sang "Croppies lie down." He considered that such conduct was an insult done in the faces of three

fourth of the population of Montreal which is composed mainly of Irish and French Canadian Catholics. Alderman Laberge concluded his eloquent speech as follows:—"I shall never consent to the payment of the sum of \$4,168 recommended by the Finance Committee to pay the volunteers who assisted at the funeral of Hackett, even when I am convinced that the law is against us. If the corporation is sued for payment of said sum, and condemned to pay the costs incurred by the council, it shall be as a protest against the conduct of those who, without cause, are responsible for calling out the troops on the 10th July. (Loud and prolonged applause in the galleries.)

Ald. Kennedy—Mr. Mayor, I regret that this question has waxed as warm as it has. I thought it would pass off quietly, and I think, the sooner it is let drop the better. (Hear, hear.) I do not object to the calling out of the volunteers, but I do object to the men that came into the city and conducted themselves as they did. I say it, and I don't fear contradiction, it was not for the love of Hackett they came. If it was, why did they cheer at the funeral in the streets? The cheering was done, no man can deny it, and it was done out of the windows at Moigne's store; every window was occupied and they cheered. The Orangemen thought they had gained a great victory, but I tell you they did not gain a great victory. And there is another man whom I cannot call less than a firebrand—this Robinson from Kingston. He said if he had come again it be "woe to Montreal." Had I been in the streets of Montreal and heard him say it I would have challenged him single-handed on the street if I were to have been killed, and I hope I shall never die until I come before this Robinson face to face, and I will test his mettle. I don't say one word to the Orangemen of Montreal, but these ruffians that they brought here who gave us such gross insults I abhor. They say the French Canadians were not insulted. Why, there are men in Montreal who sympathize with wild Indians in the bush who burned the church at Oka, and the priest's house. There is no denying it, this thing is not over. I may say if they think of coming to wipe out the Irish and French Canadians of Montreal, they are mistaken, for I tell them the French Canadians are not made of blocks of wood.

Alderman Grenier spoke once more in favor of the motion. It was now six o'clock, and Ald. Taylor moved that the Council adjourn. Amidst much disorder the votes were taken on the motion to adjourn as follows:—
Yeas—Messrs. Laurent, Mercer, Clendinning, Childs, Taylor, Genereux, Holland, Rivard and Grenier—9.
Nays—Messrs. Chausse, Laberge, Thibault, Kennedy, Robert, Wilson, Gauthier, McCambridge and Donovan—9.
The Mayor gave his casting vote in favour of the adjournment.

THE RECENT TROUBLES IN THE CITY.

(To the Editor of the Gazette.)

SIR,—If I had no other reason for trespassing once more on your columns, I should be induced to do so from finding that the Toronto *Mail* has arrived at the conclusion, from my last letter, that I have "reconsidered the question," and as it is possible that others may draw a similar inference, I am desirous that it should be clearly understood that I have not in the least modified the opinion that I formed on the subject of Orange demonstrations at a very early period of my life and that I have retained to the present day. I have, however, in my late letters contented simply that such demonstrations are inexpedient in the city of Montreal. I was induced to publish my views, because I thought that there was a leaning on the part of many to attempt to remedy the evil by legislation, which in my opinion would be an aggravation of the evil; and further, because many of those who had written on the subject seemed to be unaware of the cause which lends Irish Roman Catholics to view Orange demonstrations with feelings of bitter hostility. It has at all events been satisfactory to me to find that many Canadian Protestants were unaware, until the publication of my first letter, of the severity of the Irish penal laws against Roman Catholics. I have been assailed by more than one writer for insinuating that Canadian Orangemen of the present day are persecutors, but in truth I have been more inclined to charge them with being irrational, inasmuch as they have adopted the name and the oaths and the signs and symbols of persecutors while claiming that they are sincere friends of civil and religious liberty. I do not believe that fair discussion can injure a good cause, and although it is true, as the *Herald* justly observes, that we are "too near to the events" for either parties to listen patiently to any discussion of it, yet the great mass of the citizens of Montreal who, in my opinion, are deeply interested in the subject, will reflect on the consequences of the recent attempts to institute Orange demonstrations among them, and will, moreover, arrive at the conclusion that, even if I had not written a line, the "parties militant" would not have been less bitter. I cannot forbear offering a few observations on a very courteous criticism on my letters in the *Herald* of the 9th inst. There is much in that article in which I entirely concur; but like a great many others who have written on the subject, the writer appears to me to think that I have been inclined to palliate the conduct of those who have been disturbers of the peace. There is no one in the community more ready than myself to condemn a resort to violence or to maintain that the peace must be kept at all hazards. Surely it is not inconsistent with such an opinion to contend that it is inexpedient to make demonstrations which experiences teaches us will inevitably lead to bitterness of feeling in the community and which, even if no calamity should occur, must put the citizens at large to a serious annual expense, to say nothing of the inconvenience to our volunteers. I cannot concur with the *Herald* in thinking that "a very important part of the *res gestae* of this affair attaches to those publications which Sir Francis considers merely as the exposition of Irish Catholic feelings, but which were unfortunately also passionate incitements and exhortations addressed to the most excitable part of the Irish Catholic people." I think that such a charge should not be made without proof. I will not affirm positively that it cannot be proved, but I have not seen any violent language of the kind, and, moreover, all the attacks that I have seen on the *True Witness* are founded on articles written after the Orange procession on the 10th July, which consisted in a considerable degree of strangers armed with revolvers, and after an announcement that 20,000 strangers were required next year. An anonymous writer in the *Herald* over the non de plume

CONTINUED ON EIGHT PAGE.

ORANGE RIOTS.

Mr. Fleming's Pamphlet now published can be had at this office. News-dealers from the country supplied on liberal terms. The *Miner* says:—"The brochure entitled the 'Orange Riots' is written by a master hand."

THE EMIGRANTS' GUIDE.

A LARGE 48 Column Newspaper with illustrated heading is now out. It is an honest Guide for all classes of immigrants seeking homes and employment in the West, and describes without color or prejudice the best localities in ALL the Western States. For sale by all News Dealers. One copy mailed free. Address

M. O'DOWD, Temple Building, St. Louis, Mo