a hundred times more brilliant than his best friend could claim for him, he is not a fit person to represent Montreal. He has no influence in Parliament. Whatever he might have possessed he has destroyed by his cringing subserviency to Sir John Macdonald, who has made the overthrow of the Catholic Church in this Province, the subjugation of Catholics to Protestant supremacy, the ostracism of Irish Catholics from all share in government, the cry of his party. As the friend of Mr. White and Mr. McCarthy, whose insults and revilings will tingle for years in Catholic ears, he has ceased to have a claim, not alone on our suffrage, but on our patriotism and good temper.

Let him be advised in time, make a virtue of necessity, nor invite with brazen effrontery the terrible and crushing rebuke which Irishmen never fail to administer to those who desert and betray them.

MR. BLAKE'S RESOLUTION AND MR. COSTIGAN'S AMENDMENT.

Sir John Macdonald and Mr. Costigan have of late attempted to persuade the friends of Home Rule that their miserable, washed-out amendment was better calculated to serve the Irish cause than Mr. Blake's straight forward resolution.

The hollowness of this impudent pretence is patent to anybody who compares the two motions. We place them side by side. Let every one look on this picture and then on this and draw his own conclusions :—

MR. BLAKE'S RESOLUTION.	MR. COSTIGAN'S AMENDMENT.
"That an humble address be presented to Her Majesty to respectfully assure Her Majesty that the interest and concern felt by the Commons of Canada and the people whom they represent in the condition of Ireland, and their desire that some means may be found of meeting the expressed wishes of so many of Her Majesty's Irish subjects for the grant to Ireland of a measure of local self-government, still continue as warm and earnest as in the year 1882, when they were humbly signified to Her Majesty by an address to which the House affirms its abiding adhesion ;	"That all the words after 'That' be struck out, and the following added instead thereof: 'The Commons of Canada desire to express their deep and abiding interest in the prosperity and happiness of their fellow-subjects in Ireland, and their adhesion to the sentiments expressed in the joint address to Her Majesty of both Houses of the Canadian Parliament in the session of 1882;
Humbly to inform Her Majesty that this House hails with joy the submission by Her Majesty's Government to the Parliament of the United Kingdom of a measure recognizing the principle of local self-government for Ireland ;	That in each address Parliament suggested that Canada and its inhabitants had prospered exceedingly under a federal system, allowing to each province of the Dominion considerable powers of self-government, and expressed a hope 'that if consistent with the integrity and well being of the Empire, and if *the rights and status of the minority were fully protected and secured*, some means might be found of meeting the expressed desires of so many of Her Majesty's Irish subjects in that regard.'
And humbly to express to Her Majesty the earnest hope of this House that the principle of the said measure be affirmed, and that it may form the basis for such a settlement of this great question as shall conduce to the peace, happiness and prosperity of the Empire."	That in answer to said address the then Secretary of State for the Colonies was commanded to state: 'Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the Parliament of Canada on all matters relating to the Dominion and the administration of its affairs: but with respect to the questions referred to in the Address to Her Majesty will, in accordance with the constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the Imperial Parliament and Ministers, to whom all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain.'
	That this House, having reference to the tenor of said answer, does not deem it expedient again to address Her Majesty on the subject, but earnestly hopes that such a measure or such measures may be adopted by the Imperial Parliament as will, while preserving the integrity and well being of the Empire and *the rights and status of the minority*, be satisfactory to the people of Ireland, and permanently remove the discontent so long unhappily prevailing in that country."

Any one can see that, if Mr. Costigan's amendment means anything, it is a refusal to give the weight of Canadian opinion, expressed through and by the House of Commons, in favor of the only practicable measure of Home Rule ever proposed. Mr. Costigan's Orange-Tory masters were quite willing to give comfort to the Irish, so long as Home Rule was a nebulous proposition beyond the region of practical politics. But when it had taken shape and the Government of Great Britain had presented a measure granting self-government to Ireland, they wheeled into line with their Orange brethren in the old country, formulated the above insulting amendment, and declared themselves, as far as they dared do so, on the side of the minority in Ireland opposed to Home Rule.

And to show the devilish malignity of the spirit that prepared this poisoned dagger for the heart of Ireland, it was placed in the hands of recreant Irishmen to deliver the blow. Costigan and Curran took the weapon, accepted the Orange commission, and struck like hired assassins at the heart of their country as she was struggling to rise from the strangling grip of her tyrants!

And these men have the unspeakable audacity to present themselves for approval to Irish electors. How dare they imagine that the Irishmen of Canada have become as degraded, debauched, and enslaved to Orange-Tory ism as they are themselves! What right have they to suppose that because they are traitors all Irishmen must be traitors too? Let the history of Ireland attest as to the manner the Irish people have always dealt with men who acted as they have, and let the Irish press say in what estimation they are held.

There are eight papers published in the Dominion in the interests of the Irish people, and everyone of them stigmatised the action of Messrs. Costigan and Curran as weak cowardly and treacherous.

Truly did Mr. Blake say in his recent speech at Guelph :—"The cowardice of Conservative members, calling themselves representative Irishmen, and the bigotry of a few fanatic Tory-Orange members, prevented the voice of Canada being heard in favor of that great measure, a measure prompted, as I believe, by the desire for, and tending to, accomplish the real unity of the Empire. The sense in which we were believed to speak, the way in which what we said and did was understood, was shown by the disappointment of those who were the friends of Home Rule and the rejoicings of those who were its enemies. Those who were engaged in opposing Home Rule said it was a very good thing that my motion was defeated and that Mr. Costigan's amendment prevailed—a good thing it was for their cause, but bad for Home Rule! Those who were in favor of Home Rule, as for example, Mr. O'Brien, the late member for Tyrone, said that it was a cause for great regret that Mr. Costigan's amendment had carried and that the motion I presented was lost."

The Toronto *Week*, Goldwin Smith's paper, proves the correctness of Mr. Blake's view. In its issue immediately after the debate it said :—

"In criticising the action of Parliament, however, we must not be understood to suggest that the Parliament of the Ministry are responsible for the introduction of the subject. It was just the kind of thing that a Government detests, and that only a factious Opposition would think of bringing forward. WE ARE SURE THAT THE MINISTERS WOULD GLADLY HAVE SHELVED IT, had that been possible. As it was not possible, THEY DID THEIR BEST TO NULLIFY IT, AND THEY SUCCEEDED ADMIRABLY. This strategy has been made a ground of censure. It is, in fact, a reason for admiration and approval. When they could not entirely prevent the mischief they did their best to minimize it, and they succeeded. There is something almost comic in the wind-up. Parturient mountains never brought forth a more ridiculous mouse; and the mountains looked very serious indeed when their labor began."

What more do we require than the rejoicing of the enemies of Ireland and the sorrowing of her friends to prove the treachery, cowardice and meanness of the Irish parliamentary slaves of Orange Toryism? Would it be impertinent for us to ask if their subserviency was the price they paid for permission to share with the Boodle Brigade in the plunder of the country? And are Irishmen to condone the monstrous iniquity of which these men are guilty, in order that they may continue the betrayal of Irish rights as an equivalent for Orange patronage?

If the electors of Montreal centre are willing to accept these conditions, then God help Ireland!

A MALIGNANT HYPOCRITE.

According to *The Mail*, the two great evils that affect Canada to-day are the liquor traffic and the Catholic Church. And it hypocritically laments that these are questions which "the old parties agree to ignore." The coarse bigotry of the Tory organ in thus bracketing the Church which enjoys the heart service of two-thirds of Christianity along with a traffic which it pretends to regard as the sum of all villainies, is plainly intended to serve two purposes: To enlist Protestant prejudices and the Prohibition sentiment in the service of Toryism in the coming political contest.

Nobody who knows the men who control the chief organ can be deceived by it. If there be any so simple, the way it overdoes the thing must undeceive them. It must imagine that there is a class of people in the country whose intelligence is so blunt and whose prejudices are so strong that they can be led by the nose into any absurdity. There may be such people, but they must be few in number and small in influence. But, knowing *The Mail* and its sources of inspiration, we believe that we have in its articles the Tory idea of what will suit the tastes of a section of the Liberal party, which it hopes to detach from Mr. Blake and inveigle into the ranks of the Grand Old Boodleman. The Puritan element of the Liberal party, for which this journalistic trap is baited, does no doubt hold strong opinions on religious and social questions and their bearing in relation to politics. But the men who compose it are more likely to regard Macdonaldite corruptions and encroachments as greater menaces to popular rights than alleged aggressions of the Catholic Church, and the spirit that would stir up religious discord as worse than the spirit of alcohol.

In true Smithsonian vim *The Mail* of Saturday attacks the Church thus:—"To go no "further, her ability to sell and deliver her "corporate vote and the eagerness of poli- "ticians on both sides to buy it, enable her "to obtain special and distinctive represen- "tation in the Dominion and Provincial "Cabinets, and to place her chosen vassals in "the public service, not always because they "are fit, but simply because they are Ca- "tholics."

This in a country where the population is nearly half Catholic is refreshingly cheeky, and addressed to people who, if they know anything, must be aware that there are bishops and priests of the Catholic Church strongly attached to the Conservative party and very emphatic in their support of it. Thanks to the exertions of *The Mail* and the conduct of Sir John Macdonald's government, their number may have decreased of late. But the organ has repeated these incoherent generalities so often that a large number among those it desires to influence would like it to come down to particulars and offer some facts in support of its allegation that the Church sells and delivers her corporate vote. For many years the Conservative party enjoyed the very open and vigorous support of Catholic Church dignitaries in this province. During a considerable portion of that time *The Mail*, controlled by the same party that controls it now, never protested against the interference of priests in politics. It was silent for the simple reason that this interference was for the benefit of the Tories. The abuse it cast was suppressed by the Church itself on the report of the late Mgr. Conroy The only instance of late occurred in the recent provincial elections, and was in favor of a Conservative candidate.

If any such bargain as that described by the *Mail* ever took place, it must have been between the Church and Sir John Macdonald. The organic managers must be aware of the facts, and, if they are sincere, they will publish them. But they know their statement is a falsehood. We defy them to produce their proof. Their insincerity is already established in the minds of all who have observed the course of the *Mail* since it started. That paper has presented many a queer dish before its Tory patrons in those years, but nothing like what it is now serving up has been known since the Prophet Ezekiel made bread symbolical of affection for sin. The Tories of to-day, like the Israelites of old, seem to have deserved the same sort of treatment from outraged Providence. And, if we are to believe that good Tory, Mr. Cnagnon, they have been given companions like the one Hosea was commanded to take. Penitent rankness would better become men who have been condemned to endure these scriptural punishments than the publication of falsehood and slander.

In the same article from which we have already quoted the following passage occurs: "Let the State Church in Quebec, with her "feudal prerogatives, be disestablished, and "put on the same footing as other denomina- "tions, cost what it may."

Again we would ask our contemporary to come down to particulars? Church disestablishment is a big question. And as long as the vast majority of the people of Quebec are content to preserve their institutions as they are, where is the power on earth that can compel them to do otherwise? But the fact is, *The Mail* is talking arrant nonsense, and it knows it. If the Church in Quebec was like the established Church in Ireland there would be the strongest reasons for abolishing its prerogatives But, so long as it is believed and supported by nine-tenths of the people and puts no burdens upon the minority, the organ of a party in disgrace may rant and rave as it will. Its bigoted frothings only strengthen the Church among the people and disgust all sensible Protestants. We are quite aware that a respectable class of economists maintain that there should be no connection between Church and State. But the State is really the people in this province, and we have yet to learn that they have determined to demolish their altars out of deference to what the Orange Tories of Ontario think would be good for them.

A more melancholy exhibition of stupidity and impotency could not be imagined than that presented by the Tory party in its leading organ. It is the old intolerant *Seagan Buidhe*, palsied and feelingless, muttering curses he has no longer the strength to inflict.

"We hate him like Sin,
For his mop-head of hair,
His snub nose and bald chin,
And his turkeycock air.
We curse the cravat
That encircles his throat,
His cooking pot hat
And swallow-tail coat."

And we tell him that, if he is anxious to go into the iconoclast business, he has a splendid opportunity right here in Montreal. But there is a humiliating seriousness in the conduct of the organ of a perishing party. It is to be found in the fact that a great newspaper deems it good policy to inaugurate a war of race and religion. It must believe that ignorance and fanaticism are still powerful levers wherewith to move the Protestant masses in Canada to attack the rights and liberties of their Catholic fellow-countrymen. On behalf of the Protestant people, whom we know and respect, we repudiate the imputation; and we are ready to affirm our faith in their good will towards Catholics, despite the truculency of *The Mail*, its threats, and its incendiary appeals. Orange bigots may find satisfaction in its No Popery howlings, but men of common sense, who take a business view of life and its duties, will, when the proper time comes, render their verdict of condemnation on the newspaper and the men who would win a party triumph by means which, if successful, could only end in the ruin of the country.

TRAITORS TO HOME RULE.

The injury done to the cause of Home Rule by the wretched abortion of an amendment, proposed by Mr. Costigan and supported by Mr. Curran in the House of Commons, was very great on the other side of the water. The effect on this side of the Atlantic was not less disastrous from another point of view. Mr. Costigan and Mr. Curran, by holding a secret, hole-in-the-corner meeting of Irish Catholic supporters of the Government, and by deciding not to move a resolution of sympathy with Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell, arrogated to themselves a right to act for the Irish people in Canada which they did not possess.

Home Rule is not an Irish Catholic question. It is a principle in which Irishmen of all persuasions are equally interested and which is supported by Protestants as well as Catholics. To narrow it down in this country to a matter for manipulation by a little clique of Catholic Macdonaldites, as Mr. Costigan and Mr. Curran attempted, was an assumption of gratuitous impertinence. By acting as they did they gave offence to all Protestant Home Rulers and brought upon themselves sure and deserved reprimands from leading Liberals in Parliament, who, with their party, have persistently advocated the Irish cause. Despite their protestations to the contrary, there are strong reasons for believing that Mr. Costigan and Mr. Curran, in the secret caucus they held, treated the proposition to move a Home Rule resolution last session from a party point of view, and decided not to do so in the interests of the Tory party.

This opinion is confirmed by Mr. Curran's quotation from one of our Ottawa correspondent's letters. The remarks quoted were intended to test the sincerity of the Irish Catholic Macdonaldites. But they had neither the wisdom nor the manliness to do their duty honestly without regard to the strictures of our correspondent, who, as events proved, made no mistake in measuring them by a Tory instead of an Irish standard. The question of Home Rule is not one within the exclusive jurisdiction of Irish Catholics, much less of Irish Catholics attached to the Tory party,—a party whose hostility to the movement has been demonstrated, and whose hatred of everything Irish finds frequent expression in its leading organ. We take the same ground as Mr. Casey of Elgin: "It is a Canadian national movement; it is just as much a Canadian movement as an Irish movement," and we "deny the right of any man in Canada who is not in favor of Home Rule to call himself a loyal Canadian."

That the Tory party was a first and Home Rule a secondary consideration with Mr. Costigan and Mr. Curran is evidenced furthermore by the excuses which they gave for not moving in the matter. They said the former expression of opinion was sufficient, and it was not prudent to bring it up again because they feared, not the defeat of the motion, but a less unanimous expression of opinion than that formerly given. Could anything be more transparently hypocritical? The former expression had been given by a Parliament which had ceased to exist. A general election might have made change in parliamentary opinion. And since then the question of Home Rule had, for the first time in history, become a practical issue in the politics of the Empire. When the first resolution was adopted there was but slender op that the Government of Great Britain would take up the question of Home Rule. It was therefore necessarily a vague hope that something would be done to satisfy the claims of the Irish people to national autonomy.

Meantime Mr. Gladstone and the Liberals had succeeded to power and adopted Home Rule as a leading feature in their policy. Thus the whole situation was changed, and if Mr. Costigan and Mr. Curran were sincere Home Rulers, in the sense of cherishing their Irish principles above their party attachments, they would not have waited to be urged to act, nor would they, when Mr. Blake took up the question, have busied themselves in forging excuses so contemptible as those they advanced in palliation of their manifest and cowardly neglect of a great and solemn duty.

But our recreant representatives, once their Tory instincts got the better of their Irish professions, seem to have become recklessly indifferent as to what injury they inflicted on the Home Rule cause, so long as they could, in any way, prevent Mr. Blake *from* getting credit for doing what they had shamefully neglected. Even had Mr. Blake's resolution been adopted, the objections raised to it by Mr. Costigan and Mr. Curran would have weakened it materially. To the amendment, however, we must look for the full measure of the treachery, cowardice, sycophantic subserviency, of Mr. Curran and his leader Mr. Costigan.

Mr. Blake's resolution proposed an address to the Queen. Mr. Costigan's amendment was addressed to nobody, and after having been bandied about, spat upon, execrated by everybody, and especially besmirched by every Orange Tory, it was carried. What to do with it was the next puzzle presented for solution to the giant intellects of the fathers of the abortion. Another exhibition of cowardice, bewildered with its own meanness, was displayed, till finally, amid jeers, sneers and derisive laughter, it was decided to send the dirty thing to Tupper!

Such, O Irishmen! was the conduct and conclusion of the men who pretend to represent you in the Parliament of Canada. Nothing more grotesquely disgraceful, and to the last degree contemptible, has ever been recorded during the long struggle for Irish independence. One should think that, after the cowardly sacrifice Mr. Costigan and Mr. Curran made of their Irish professions at the bidding of their Orange masters, they would hang their head for shame. But, no. They attempt to plead that their wretched amendment was acceptable to the Home Rulers of Ireland. The following letter is conclusive on that point. It is from the Rev. Father Flannery, parish priest of St. Thomas, Ont., and was published, with a communication from the gentleman to whom it is addressed, in the *Irish Canadian* a few weeks ago :—

ST. THOMAS, Sept. 18, 1886.

James Brady, Esq., Ingersoll:

DEAR SIR,—In reply to yours of the 14th inst., requesting me to state in writing what I told you of the conversation I had with Mr. Wm. O'Brien, ex-M.P. of Tyrone, on their R. platform here I have merely to reiterate the statement that in my presence and the presence and hearing of Dr. Wilson, M.P., and of many others, Mr. O'Brien said: "It was a great pity and misfortune the resolution of Mr. Ed. Blake did not pass the House of Commons of Canada, as it would have strengthened our hands very materially in the Home Rule debate." I am, dear sir, yours very respectfully,

W. FLANNERY, P.P.

After this truthful exhibition of a most shameful episode in the history of the Home Rule movement, Mr. Curran must possess superhuman impudence should he claim a renewal of confidence *from* the electors of Montreal Centre. He has been tried and found wanting—wanting in that which Irishmen demand should be the best, the truest, the most unbending characteristic in their representation—devotion to the cause of Ireland.

Let him look to his Orange-Tory allies for a seat in Parliament. He belongs to them, not to the Irishmen of Montreal, who cannot accept his candidature without assuming and wearing the same execrable badge that has been placed around his neck by Sir John Macdonald—a man who has put upon record that "he has no confidence in the breed" to which they are proud to belong.

OUR OTTAWA LETTER

[*From Our Own Correspondent.*]

OTTAWA, Nov. 4.—Sir A. T. Galt has been in the city for the past few days attending to his duties as chairman of the Railway Commission. During his stay Sir John Macdonald has had frequent interviews with him, with the object, according to an apparently well-founded rumor, of inducing him to enter the Cabinet as Minister of Finance. What success may have attended this latest attempt to strengthen a weak and tottering Ministry is not known; but I have good reasons for thinking that Sir Alexander will not assume the responsibility.

If my memory serves me correctly it is now about nineteen years since Sir Alexander Galt formally withdrew his support from Sir John Macdonald and crossed the floor of the House of Commons. He did not go into active opposition, but when the term ended he retired from parliament and has never since sought or occupied

A REPRESENTATIVE POSITION.

Sir John, however, has been careful to keep him on his hands, doubtless with a view to just such a contingency as that which has now arisen. Sir Alexander has, during his retirement, been the frequent occupant of highly honorably and lucrative positions. He has also been the recipient of distinguished favors in other respects, favors which have established his fortune on a pretty firm foundation. Born in 1817, he is now in his 69th year, and is undoubtedly the ablest financier and statesman in the Conservative party, if he could only be made available. But, though a nominal Conservative, he is an old-time Liberal and a warm personal friend of Sir Richard Cartwright, with whose views on finance he is generally believed to be in sympathy. Sir Richard, it is well known, first broke with the Conservative party at the time Sir Alexander Galt retired from the cabinet and went into opposition. Private as well as public reasons impelled those two gentlemen, among the most talented and respectable members of the Conservative party, to withdraw their support of Sir John Macdonald.

TIME AND EVENTS

have, I believe, strengthened instead of weakened those reasons. Nor is Sir Alexander, even were these objections removed, likely to cast in his lot with a ministry so discredited and a party so discreditable at a time when their expulsion from power is a foregone conclusion. A man who has made so few mistakes as Sir Alexander Galt, and whose sagacity is almost proverbial, is not the person to spoil his record and make a mess of his reputation at the grand climacteric of a long and uniformly successful career.

But there are two articles in Sir Alexander's political faith to which he clings with all the tenacity of his nature. He believes that Canada ought to be independent, and he is emphatically opposed to what he calls "the pretensions of the Roman Catholic Church in Quebec." The first of these raises an impassible barrier between him and Sir John, even were he willing to sink his personal objections to association with the Premier. The second would afford him standing room with the Conservative party since its new departure in opposition to old alliances. But so keen an observer of events, and so close an analysist of political motives, cannot have failed to be convinced of the

GROSS INSINCERITY AND HYPOCRISY

of Sir John Macdonald. The course pursued by the English and French Conservative papers will not have escaped his notice, nor failed to emphasize the reasons which, nineteen years ago, compelled him to disassociate himself from the Conservative party.

Quite possibly Sir John Macdonald may be a secret convert to Sir Alexander Galt's views, with reference to the policy of the Catholic Church, and it does look as if *The Mail* had taken Sir Alexander's pamphlets on this question, published some twelve years ago, as its text in its present crusade against the Catholic Church. Those pamphlets belong to that rather excitable and somewhat voluminous literature which sprang up in opposition to the decrees of the Ecumenical Council. But while Sir Alexander was careful to proclaim his conviction "that the discussion belongs wholly to the "civil or political phase of human society," the *Mail*, lacking his wisdom and good feeling, carries it to the extreme of

BIGOTRY AND INTOLERANCE.

Were Sir John Macdonald and the Conservative party in Quebec, as in Ontario, to take a stand boldly, uncompromisingly, on the principles laid down in Sir Alexander Galt's pamphlets on "Civil Liberty in Lower Canada" and "Church and State," and adopt independence as a plank in their platform, Sir Alexander might not only enter the Cabinet, but he would undoubtedly become the leader of the Conservative party reconstructed on these lines. But, as matters stand, he is not likely to seek guarantees of good faith in the insincerity, shiftiness, double dealing and

CONFIRMED SCAMPISHNESS

of Sir John Macdonald. People have respect for Sir Alexander Galt, though they may not share his apprehensions, which they have not for Sir John Macdonald, who, everybody is convinced, would make friends with any power, divine or diabolical, sooner than lose his position of Premier. For these reasons I am inclined to think Sir Alexander will not lend himself to the cause of Macdonaldism in its days of decrepitude, and when all who listen may hear the death-rattle in its throat.

But even were Sir Alexander's worst fears to be realized as to the alleged aggressions of the hierarchy and priesthood of Quebec, we could afford to wait with some of his own assumed philosophical calmness for the denouncement which he predicts at the conclusion of his pamphlet on

"CHURCH AND STATE"

in startling and livid colors. Let me quote his words (page 40) :—

"If this struggle is allowed to extend and in- "tensify, then the day which sees the triumph "of the priest will usher in that which will "overthrow his power forever. It is impossible "that in a province of the Protestant Empire, "on the continent of America, in the presence "of forty millions of Protestants, a slavery "should be imposed upon us by the Roman "Catholic Hierarchy, which exists no longer "even under the shadow of the Vatican. Free "speech, free thought and a free press must "have the fullest scope in America; and "if, in a wild scheme to reduce them to obedi- "ence to the will of the priesthood, they be for "a moment reproved, all history tells us that "the torrent, when it bursts, will sweep away "far more than the barrier that arrested its "course—and will leave behind the wreck of "many noble Catholic institutions to mock the "folly of those who make unwilling adversaries "of natural and affectionate friends."

A PROTESTANT

holding these views we can understand and reason with. He is a very different person from the fanatic of *The Mail* or the Mephistophelian politician who is endeavoring to win a party success, under the Protestant colors in Ontario and the Ultramontane flag in Quebec. If Conservatism is to be resolved into a No Popery party Sir John should abandon all disguises at once, accept both planks in Sir Alexander Galt's platform, place him in the position he offered Sir Charles Tupper, and go the country on the square issues thus presented.

A little reflection, however, will show that British and Protestant supremacy are, paradoxical as it may seem, incompatible. By independence or annexation only can the object sought by Sir Alexander Galt be attained. Even in either event the result is highly problematical. Nothing, however, is more certain than that the relations between church and state in the Province of Quebec cannot be disturbed as long as the Dominion of Canada remains a part of the British Empire, secured by treaty rights, and the still greater, more powerful right inherent in the people, as free men endowed with free institutions and the right to

GOVERN THEMSELVES IN THEIR OWN WAY.

To talk of supressing or curtailing the influence of the church, so long as our constitution remains as it is, is eminently absurd. Were all the Protestants in the country to unite for that purpose they could not accomplish it, but the result of such a combination would be disastrous in the extreme to every material interest affecting Protestants and Catholics alike and speedily put an end to the Dominion even as a geographical entity.

The more I reflect upon this question the more thoroughly am I convinced of the lunacy of the policy adopted by Sir John Macdonald to retain himself in power. He stands to lose as much as he can win by the race and religion cry. Our population is about equally divided, with the Catholics in possession of the casting vote in many constituencies. But if he has fallen into the error, common among Protestants who have not intimately acquainted themselves with Catholic polity, of imagining the Church as a foe to free institutions, I would point to the great modern fact that nowhere in the world has Catholicity achieved greater triumphs than in free England and republican America.

Furthermore, since Sir John Macdonald has directed the attack on the faith and liberties of his Catholic fellow-countrymen, whether through design of catching the Protestant vote or through ignorance and hatred, he has left the Catholics of the country no option but to unite with the Liberals for his throw.

RIDEAU.

BOURGET COLLEGE, RIGAUD, P.Q.

Last Wednesday evening the students of Bourget College, at Rigaud, P.Q., favored the public with a dramatic and musical entertainment, which was of a most agreeable nature. Although the roads were muddy, they did not prevent a great many members of the clergy, friends of the college, and relations of the pupils from being in attendance. A great many prominent citizens of Montreal were remarked amongst the distinguished audience. Space will only permit giving a brief synopsis of the performances. At 8 p.m. the execution of the capital programme began by the representation of the beautiful drama in five acts "Edward the Confessor," which was rendered in a praiseworthy manner by all the respective actors. The proceedings of this excellent tragedy were interspersed with a choice selection of quartettes, executed by the college choir in a manner that elicited showers of applause and *encores* from the pleased listeners. The well-chosen comedy "Lawyer Patelin" occupied a very prominent place on the evening's programme. It won the hearty applause of the respectable spectators, who were held under a spell of laughter which only melted away after they dispersed on their homeward route. Taking a respective glance at the whole entertainment the observers pronounced it a decided success, and tendered their most cordial congratulations to the moderators and histrionic actors for the untiring efforts with which they labored to render the *soiree* interesting. Their endeavors were crowned with a wreath of well-merited success. The pupils of the superior and senior classes, members of St. Patrick's Literary Association, speak of organizing a grand entertainment for St. Patrick's evening. The Irish dramas "Robert Emmett" and "Barney the Baron" will be probably performed.

AN INDIGNANT COLONY.

QUEENSLAND FORCIBLY PROTESTS AGAINST ENGLAND'S APATHY REGARDING THE NEW GUINEA MURDERS.

BRISBANE, Australia, Nov. 6.—A meeting has been held here to express the indignation felt by the people of Queensland at the apathy displayed by England in not punishing the natives of New Guinea for the murders of white men, rendering the island unsafe for trade. A despatch was sent to the authorities in London, notifying them of the murder of Capt. Craig, of the ship Emily, two sailors and six Malays, and declaring that the present state of things cannot continue.

A GEORGIA TRAGEDY.

A PASSING REMARK TO A NEGRO GIRL CAUSES THE DEATH OF TWO PERSONS AND THE SEVERE WOUNDING OF TWO MORE.

MONTGOMERY, Ala., November 6.—The following special has been received from Shellman, Ga.: Shellan, familiarly known as Ward station, in this county, was lately the scene of a dastardly attempt upon the part of a family of negroes to take the lives of several of the best citizens of that place, in which they partially succeeded, and in which one of their number was shot dead. George Oliver is postmaster, express agent and telegraph operator, in which he is assisted by his son Joe, a young man just attaining manhood. Yesterday a negro girl named Frances Coleman went to the depot to look after a box. While there she took offence at something, and returning home, half a mile from the depot, told her brothers, who, resenting the supposed indignity to their sister, armed themselves this morning with sticks and knives, and, seeking out Joe Oliver, at an opportune time set upon him suddenly, plunging a knife into his throat. The negroes then fled, but were pursued by Jesse Oliver and his brother, father and uncle of the unfortunate lad. When the negroes arrived at home their mother ran out with a musket, which she handed to one of her sons. He shot Jesse Oliver through the arm. One of the negroes was killed by the Olivers and the other fled to the woods, where he is now being hunted. A third negro man, the girl and the mother were arrested and brought here this evening under a heavy guard. It is thought both Olivers will die.

General Citizen—"Why do you exclude lawyers from the Knights of Labor?" Knight of Labor—"Because they produce nothing." G. C.—"Did you ever employ a lawyer and ask him to produce his bill?"

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC, DISTRICT OF MONTREAL. Superior Court. Mrs. Mary Ann Dussault, Plaintiff, vs. Charles Gingras, undertaker, of the city of Montreal, said district, Defendant. Notice is hereby given that the Plaintiff in this case has instituted an action in separation as to properties against the Defendant on the 18th of October last.

Montreal, November 6th, 1886.

J. T. R. LORANGER,
13-5 Attorney for Plaintiff.

PROVINCE OF QUEBEC, DISTRICT OF MONTREAL. Superior Court. Dame Olive Landry, plaintiff, vs. Jean Emmanuel Viger, lumber merchant of Montreal, Defendant. Notice is hereby given that the Plaintiff, in this case, has instituted an action in separation as to properties, against the Defendant, on the 18th of October last,

Montreal, Nov. 6th, 1886.

J. T. R. LORANGER,
13 5 Attorney for Plaintiff.