

for. What they were is not the question, for what they are is the point of issue. People tell us that Sir John A. Macdonald was the friend of the Catholics of Quebec when he was in power. Well, perhaps he was, but there was no Orange question here then. New issues are now before the country, and the party back is not the man on whom we could depend to fight them out. Canada to-day is not the Canada of five years ago. Since then a new aspect has been given to Canadian affairs. Since then a burning question has come before us all, and this burning question will, no doubt, occupy some portion of the time of the coming Parliament, no matter whether that Parliament be Rouge or Bleu. Until that question is settled, peace or prosperity is not possible. We may have Protection or Free Trade to our hearts' content, but while the Orange cancer is gnawing at our heart, ruin and, perhaps, war may be the inevitable consequences. Now, who will fight our side of these questions in the House of Commons? The Orangemen have their champions, but where are ours? Is he to be found in the party back? Certainly not! He is only to be found in the man who will go to the House of Commons indifferent to the blandishments of the Orange leaders or the Orange abettors. He can only be found in an Independent member who is not afraid of one side nor of the other. Oh! but we are told what good can one Independent member do. He will be alone, and will not have the support of any party. Oh! but we reply, that is all you know about it, and if you could only see straight you would see that the Independent member is not asked to be alone. He can have his party, but he should be "Independent" first. He may agree with one side or the other upon the great fiscal questions of the day, but he can be Independent upon all questions affecting our interests. But we are told—Yes, but you know so-and-so will be Independent when those interests are assailed. Then we answer—Why not frankly and boldly say so? Why not announce it to the world and take the consequences? No private promises will do—we want the public pledge, and the man who does not give that public pledge falls short of our idea. Orangism must be fought inch by inch and we want one to do it. Are we all so destitute of manliness that we cannot stand together in a issue such as is now before the country? The hostile press will tell us that we are raising new and exciting issues, and that we are agitating the public mind. Yes, we are, and we think it high time that the public mind was agitated, but we do it as the friend of those whose lips have been hitherto sealed, but whose voice, at least as far as we can, shall be heard throughout the land. Let no one think that it is we who advocate the separation of our people from party. We advocate nothing of the kind. All we want is for a man to be an Independent Conservative or an Independent Reformer, but the Independent must be first, and by that we mean that he must fight the battles of his own people first and fight the battles of his party afterwards. That is our position now, as it has been in the commencement, and from it we shall not swerve, no matter who proves recalcitrant in the hour of trial.

#### THE VOLUNTEER MILITIA.

Partisanship is a disgrace to any military corps. It is expressly forbidden by the Queen's Regulations and Orders for the Army, and the men found guilty of it are liable to punishment. It is ruinous to military discipline, and creates, in public opinion, a want of confidence in the troops who show evidences of party feeling. This, everyone who values truth must admit. The Volunteer Militia belongs to the country, and not to Protestant or Catholic—it is the property of all—and the men who, in the ranks, show evidences of party feeling do more to undermine the laws and pave the way for disturbance than a host of demagogues. That that party feeling is too manifest, we think no one will deny. Here in Montreal it shows itself, and it appears to defy the authorities to suppress it. This fact is too well known to need proof. Again, our youths are shot down in open daylight, and an enquiry is, it appears, burked upon the fictitious plea of expenses. A glaring outrage is committed and no one is brought to task for the crime. In any other country an investigation would have been at once instituted, but here political considerations carry all before them, and so far, no enquiry has been made. We see two volunteer bands play at Orange celebrations and no notice, apparently, taken of it, and at Toronto last night, we hear of members of the 10th Royals attending the Orange demonstration and attacking the St. Patrick's Hall. At present the full particulars of the last outrage are not yet to hand, but even if it turns out that the volunteers were in uniform, we do not expect that the slightest notice will be taken of it. It appears to be regarded as a matter of course that Orangemen when in uniform may attend whatever demonstrations they please, and do pretty much as they like. Military law they may violate, and they only come under suspicion when they outrage the common law of the land. Now, let us see how it is with corps that are known not to have Orange sympathies. We all remember the story of the eight rifles, and the enquiry that was at once instituted by telegraph. That enquiry no one objected to. On the information supplied, perhaps, the military authorities could not have done otherwise. It was perfectly right to sift a dangerous rumor to its source at once. But since then we have had another proof of the promptitude with which the military authorities look after Catholic corps. On the *Feu Dieu* the 65th Battalion and the St. Jean Baptiste Infantry Company attended the pro-

cession as a guard of honor, and shortly after an order came from headquarters that corps should not turn out in future without special permission from headquarters. Now, this order is all right too. No one has one word to say against it, but it is not somewhat odd, that with all the evidences of party feeling, with all the direct violation of military law, with all the open defiance of the authorities which have been indulged in by members of other corps, not one word of enquiry have we ever heard about? This is certainly not the way to create confidence in the impartial administration of the Volunteer Militia, and when we couple it with the fact that we have been denied the formation of another corps, after we had companies disbanded for that purpose, it leaves upon the minds of the Catholics of the country a very unpleasant impression indeed. Some people may think that we should hold our peace on this subject, but why? Is it to the interest of the service or for the good of the country that these evils should pass unnoticed? Are we to be told that these plague spots should be allowed to gnaw at one of the most vital of our institutions, and that we should make no efforts to bring about a cure? We want to see a Volunteer Militia which the people can trust without doubt as to its impartiality. The officers, we know, are all that can be desired. There is not a commanding officer we know in whom we would not place implicit confidence for the impartial discharge of their duty. We have learned to know them, and the more we know of them the more we respect them. Even against their co-religionists we believe they would show fair play and stand by the laws, no matter which side suffered. But, we ask, would they not be the better able to do this if their corps were mixed? Protestant or Catholic corps, except in the case of French Canadians, are in this country a great mistake, and if the commanders of battalions would open their ranks to Catholics, more would be done to bring about a good feeling between men of different persuasions than one can readily imagine. If this is not done immediately, then we must only continue to agitate it until it is. In a constitutional country agitation is the only weapon that a lawful citizen can use, and we have reason to believe that by persistently agitating any grievance we shall ultimately obtain justice.

#### THE ST. JOHN "FREEMAN."

The St. John Freeman is not satisfied with the position taken by the Post. The St. John Freeman is a party paper, and, therefore, we expected nothing from it but dissent. But it is the dissent of a friend and not the dissent of an enemy. It says that the position of the Irish Catholics of Montreal is "unpleasant, and surrounded with difficulties; and it is presumed that they themselves know best what duty requires of them under the circumstances. Their own future welfare and the welfare of the country depend much on the prudence and patriotism of their action." No doubt our position is "surrounded with difficulties." Alone we count for little, united with a party we may count for much. But we think it possible to be alone, and yet be united. We think it possible to pledge our support to either Reformers or Conservatives on the great fiscal questions of the day and still retain our Independence upon all questions affecting the interests of our people. Is it not a fact that both parties use us, and is it not time to open our eyes to it? Is it not a fact that both parties will treat us better when they discover that we shall no longer consent to be made a cat-paw for them? We have the power if we only know how to use it. We can punish those who desert us, if we only insist upon some recognition of our claims, which we can do, by sending men to the House of Commons who may be party-men, but who will be our men too, and who will go to the House proclaiming it.

#### THE DISLOYALTY QUESTION AND THE TARIFF.

Disloyalty again! Apart from the early revolutionary platform, the removal of the civil disabilities in England, the emancipation of Slavery, the struggles for the equal rights and liberties of citizens, and for the liberty of the press, there seems to be few questions which have furnished the statesman, the political economist, the journalist, the professional politician, the demagogue, and the brawler, with more material than the tariff question. For centuries it has engaged the attention and wisdom of the public mind of Great Britain and Ireland. For centuries it gave rise to the statesmanship of France and Germany. For nearly a century has it baffled the great minds of the past generation of American statesmen. Austria, Russia, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Belgium, and most other European countries, took part in the contest. Australia, and most of the States of Central and South America have followed suit, while Canada was not behind. For a few years back the world seems to have enjoyed a rest from the seemingly perpetual turmoil. But now the agitation sets in again, and threatens another closely continued struggle. Already it is becoming general in Germany, France, England, and particularly in the United States, while it promises greater activity and intensity than ever in Canada.

At times this agitation was alarming intense, notably so in the years between 1840 and 1845, in England—those memorable days that witnessed the struggle of such minds as Sir Robert Peel, Gladstone, Bright, and Cobden, for the repeal of the Corn Laws; also in the years between 1820, and 1846, in the United States, when the giant intellects of Webster, Clay, Calhoun, Wright, and Hayne were roused to the highest pitch in the memorable contest for Protection to American industries, which was finally achieved, to the

glory of her truest patriots. But, throughout all this, we doubt whether any attempt was made to identify the question with disloyalty or treason, and we question the propriety of doing it now, by the Free Trade or any other press. We question whether wilder theory and speculation, more inappropriate and subtle arguments, grosser mis-statement of facts, baser attempts to mislead the public mind have been attempted than we find displayed, even in the leading portion of the Free Trade press of the country—journals for whose views in most other cases we entertain every respect. We credit sound reasoning, theories, and arguments, wherever we find them; we admire precision in the statement of facts, but we hate to see sophistry and misrepresentation attempted instead. Both in England and the United States though, perhaps, unlike the case in other questions even of less national importance, honesty of purpose, strict observance of sound, consistent as well as appropriate reasoning, and reasonable precision in the statement of facts, characterized those animated and protracted discussions.

The Toronto Globe, under date of July 11th, made a most serious, if not unkind charge of disloyalty upon all people differing from its views of the tariff policy which the government of Canada should pursue, in order to speedily effect Canadian prosperity. We confess we are deeply interested in Canadian prosperity and progress, but we confess also that we cannot see the sense of our contemporary's theory as to how this state of things is to be brought about, or as to how far legislation be made to assist in so doing.

The Post, it may be remembered, finding this theory of the Globe entirely unsound, took exception to it, and was not slow to refute the charge of disloyalty, with which it was then content to have left it so. The views of the Post have since been fully endorsed by other journals following up in its path, in refutation of the same argument. Seeing, and doubtless regretting its mistake, our contemporary attempted an apology last Saturday by hoping that its opponents were loyal, but that their "acts" indicated the opposite, which evidently meant a repetition of the charge of disloyalty in a new fashion. All now, that is disloyal is their "acts," and not themselves. Accordingly, so long as they continue to differ from the Globe's views of fiscal legislation as applicable to Canada, so long shall they be disloyal. We question this, for outside of the lunatic asylum every man of ordinary intelligence, not in a state of temporary madness is supposed to be responsible for his acts. Generally therefore, one is aware of his acts, and if aware that he is committing a treasonable act, he himself, as well as his acts, must be treasonable. What, then, can be the difference in meaning between one's own disloyalty and that of his acts? Our contemporary will probably give the answer: no one else can. We care not what may have been the motives of our contemporary, that is, whether Free Trade or Protective in adopting such a questionable line of argument,—in adopting one theory more than another regarding the tariff in its relation to the welfare of Canada,—in ignoring the lessons and examples of established usages,—or in denying the right of our Parliament to change the fiscal policy of the Government at pleasure, as may seem to it more equitable and judicious, as well as most applicable to our home interests, without first a license for so doing from British merchants. We take the principles and alleged truths as we find them laid down. We examine them accordingly. We can only, however, notice the leading points which our contemporary holds up to the view.

This particular charge of disloyalty on the part of the Globe arises out of the point whether or not England has delegated the right to the Parliament of Canada to enact laws regulating her own fiscal affairs; whether those laws could be framed on a basis to encourage Canadian industry and competition to the exclusion of British competition, and the results of British industry. Now, the Post maintains that England has delegated such a right, not only in the British North American Act of Confederation, not only by the Act granting Responsible Government, but by the voice of the British Constitution, which restrains England from legislating for any of her colonies not having representatives in the English Parliament; it restrains even the Royal prerogative from interference, except in cases of rebellion. In this view, the Post is supported by a large majority of the leading press, by all the Protectionists, who consist of most of the leading merchants, statesmen, and all the industrial classes of the country; while our contemporary contends in the following strain that England has not delegated such a right to Canada, which, were Canada to exercise it, would, according to the Globe, be equal to opening a war upon England. "By no act or deed has England delegated the right to Canada to declare war against 'Imperial interests. No party in Britain, 'not even a single statesman, has ever declared 'it right for us to erect impenetrable barriers 'against the importation of articles which 'the people of Great Britain may desire to 'export.' The Free Trade element, of course, as well as all others who are equally hostile to home industry, endorses all this for our contemporary.

Now, by these "barriers," our contemporary means that the proposed re-adjustment of the tariff by the Protectionists, in order to encourage and to give new life to home industry; in order to employ home labor in preference to foreign labor—a preference which every generous Canadian heart should be willing to make; in order to invite the investment of foreign capital in our midst, in our works, manufactures and mining enterprise; and in order to pre-

vent, perhaps, \$100,000,000 of our gold supply from annually passing out of the country, without any permanent profit to ourselves in any way whatsoever. And the act of accomplishing all this, namely, the act of manufacturing in Canada the goods that we now get from England and the United States, which would keep our money in circulation among ourselves, together with the acts of our Parliament in erecting those "barriers" without, as we have said before a license from British merchants who would be the only ones affected by such "acts" on our part, are the "acts" which our contemporary pronounces disloyal.

We have now given the entire ground upon which the Globe rests its case of treason. To-day we cannot follow it any further, but leave it to the good sense of our readers to decide whether the Post's views of Canadian constitutional rights are, or are not, the right views; whether its policy of checking foreign importation by means of home industry and legislation is not the right policy for Canada to pursue. But having proved this policy correct the other day, having proved Canada's present policy of importation as ruinous, having proved Canadian industry as essential to her future, we are sure of the verdict. We have been long enough silent upon this question, but the more we look into it, the more are we satisfied that PROTECTION IS NECESSARY FOR CANADA.

#### WHAT THE PEOPLE SAY.

##### ORANGISM IN QUEBEC.

To the Editor of the EVENING POST.

DEAR SIR,—I was surprised on reading in the Post of Friday last, under the above heading, that "since the twelfth of July several citizens suspected of being Orangemen are unable, with safety, to leave their houses, while others have had to move to new residences. To aggravate the matter, it is said that the Catholic Union party are circulating rabid party songs." Now, sir, you must not be surprised when I tell you that the above, which originally appeared in your morning contemporary the Herald, is without any foundation. I drew the attention of the chief officer of the Orange Young Britons in this city to the above sensation, and asked him if there was any truth in it, and his answer was, "It is false." If such things happened here, he surely would know something about the matter. I also enquired of another prominent member of the organization if he knew anything about it, and he candidly said he did not.

I think, sir, this is proof enough that the Herald correspondent lied, and knowingly must have lied. With respect to the last sentence, which says "the Catholic Union party are circulating rabid songs," he has lied again, as the Catholic Union of this city had no more to do with the composition, printing or circulation of the songs in question than the Herald's lying correspondent himself, for the simple reason that they were not written nor printed in this city.

The good name of this city has suffered lately by lying sensational correspondents, and for all we know to the contrary this individual may be one of them. Probably it is he who furnished the New York Herald with the lying report which appeared in that very unreliable journal on the 10th of July last, concerning the conduct of the "roughs" who went to Montreal on the 12th. No doubt this Herald correspondent would feel jubilant were Catholics and Protestants in this city cutting each other's throats; but thank God he shall never see that day, as Catholics and Protestants will, it is to be hoped, live in the future as they have in the past—in peace and harmony.

Apologizing for trespassing on your valuable space, and wishing the EVENING POST an honorable and successful career,

I remain, dear sir,

Your obedient servant,  
W. LATTEY,  
Grand President I. C. U., Quebec.  
Quebec, August 12, 1878.

##### DEATH OF A HIGHLANDER.

To the Editor of the EVENING POST.

DEAR SIR,—I am sorry to chronicle the death of an eminent Highlander, Mr. Alexander Macdonald, who departed this life August 7th, 1878. For several years past he devoted his life to that of lumbering, giving employment to hundreds of clansmen, with whose name your readers are familiar. For several days past he was in bad health, but as people have hopes even to the last, his family most likely thought that he might recover. Alas, it was the reverse. God wanted his friend to himself, so he called him away from his earthly home to those mansions which He has prepared for all who keep his commandments. Glengarry mourns his loss; is it any wonder that it would? The very bell at Dalhousie would never have been there had it not been for him and his Highland clansmen, here he has left us a stately memorial of his candor. The bell that announces the birth of an innocent child or the sacrifice of the Holy Mass reminds the sons and daughters of the Highland clans that although the tongue of its founder is silent in the tomb, yet it lives in the tongue of the bell, in the message which it rings out to the descendants of the Highlanders who dwell around Dalhousie, cannot help but offer at least one Pater Noster for the dear soul of him who was the leader in so good a work, and for all those who still survive in a corrupted world. His remains were brought from the States on August 10, to the house of his father-in-law, Mr. Wm. Bathurst, where it remained a few hours for all near and dear friends to drop a tear on, or raise a prayer to the Throne of God for the repose of the soul of Alexander Macdonald, whose remains lay cold in death, enshrined in a metal casket. At about 2.45 p. m. the funeral procession formed up, and at about 3.15 p. m. the last carriage was out of sight. It arrived in Alexandria at about five p. m., where the remains were deposited in the family vault to await the final resurrection. Requiescat in Pace.

E. R. A. F.  
Glengarry, August 12, 1878.

To the Editor of the EVENING POST.

SIR,—I have just returned from Kingston—the "Derry of Canada"—where the "defenders of civil and religious liberty" were closing the gates of Derry. The programme for the evening included the burning of Mayor Beaudry in effigy. They tried to carry out this part of the celebration—His Worship was handed over to his executioners, "The Young Britons." The match was applied, but it seemed as if the inanimate statue was imbued with some of the staunch, unyielding character of its original, for (mirabile dictu) it refused to burn! Again and again were the flaming torches applied—they poured coal

oil on it—but in vain; it simply smoked. It might be said to have scowled defiantly at its persecutors—to have hurled back into their faces the black smoke of contempt—to mock their impotent fury as they danced and howled around it, like Mohawks performing a war dance. The lambent tongues of flame licked it round—they darted and twined themselves about it—but all as impotent in their efforts to destroy as the tongues of their scarcely less fiery authors to injure our heroic Guardian of the Peace. There it stood, and as it swayed in the breeze you imagined its sides shook with laughter at their discomfiture; many spectators began to quietly enjoy the turn of affairs; the moon, which at the commencement of their orgies had veiled her face in a partial eclipse, now gradually emerged from shadow and smiled on the discomfited canaille. The actors in the drama were not unconscious of the absurdity of the position—the fire demon had refused to obey their behests; finally, losing confidence in that element, they attacked the smoky manikin with clubs; they valorously completed what should be first in the assault: "was there a man dismayed?"—no, not one. The Young Britons are very brave!—very. How is it that they did not "hang Mayor Beaudry," &c., when he marched last 12th of July into their hall here unattended save by a single policeman? They were glad enough then to accept his escort—to sneak home protected by the man whom, at a safe distance, they valorously insult. Brave Britons!

Yours, &c.,  
X.  
Montreal, August 14, 1878.

To the Editor of the EVENING POST.

DEAR SIR,—To-day being the civic holiday, the Orangemen and their sympathizers held high carnival. You are aware that they did not walk on the 12th of July last, as they expected to be called to Montreal to help their brethren there; they proposed instead to walk on the 12th of August, to celebrate the Relief of Derry, and to lay the corner stone of a hall at Portmouth. They manifested their appreciation of civil and religious liberty by "walking over the crows," "kicking the Pope," and "sprinkling the Papishes" to their heart's content, for such is their idea of the above named liberty.

Considerable disappointment was felt at the Government not allowing the A. Battery band to play for them, which they did in civilian's dress, in former years. I think the Government is thus trying to redeem, to a certain extent, the false move it made in ordering out the troops at Montreal last 12th July. The procession, headed by Thomas Robinson of the Customs House, and John Manning, Deputy Warden of the Penitentiary, was composed of the usual mixture, nearly every color in the spectrum being represented. I even seen some with green badges. This, I have been told, is a very high degree, others, aping the Free Masons, wore aprons, but I noticed that the peaceful square and compass were supplanted by more congenial swords. Of the men who composed the procession I will not say anything; you saw a good sample of them on the 10th July 77, and their appearance was not very creditable. At the tail end of the march came a carriage drawn by four white horses, and contained William Robinson and three clergymen; these were the dignitaries that were to lay the corner stone. After that ceremony a picnic was held in the Crystal Palace grounds. At 8 o'clock in the evening a grand torch-light procession took place, and an effigy was burnt in front of the Orange Hall on Princess street. The grand (?) procession consisted of forty-two Young Britons of the usual stamp, headed by a band. Behind this band came a long line of gilders erected on it, upon which hung the effigy. No name was given to this, but we know very well for whom it was meant. When they got in front of the hall they proceeded to burn the effigy, amidst the shouts and yells of the motley crowd who gathered around, and the invigorating strains of "Croppies, lie down," "Protestant Boys," and "God Save the Queen." The burning of the effigy came very near being a fiasco of the worst kind, as it obstinately and unreasonably refused to burn, and it had to be taken down, partly dissolved, and well saturated with oil before it would condescend to light up. I left as the last sparks were dying out and the crowd dispersing, and fastened myself upon the thought that, in spite of their bombast, bravado and childish fury, the man whose image they burnt to-night, unlike their effigy, is far from being a man of straw, and that they did not walk in Montreal after all—and that's where the laugh comes in.

But what did it amount to when everything was over? A great deal of noise, a great deal of insult to peaceful citizens, a great deal of money less in pocket, a great deal more in law-room tills, headaches, trembling hands, and a little ashes wafted hither and thither by the idle breeze—and that is all.

Yours sincerely,  
CASSIDY.  
Kingston, August 12, 1878.

To the Editor of the EVENING POST.

SIR,—At 2.30 p. m. to-day (Sunday) the splendid steamer "Manitola" arrived here with a large number of Catholic Union men of Carillon (both French and Irish), accompanied by their President, John Kelly, and his sons, Messrs. Brophy, Boyer and Fitzgerald, and a number of other gentlemen and ladies, who are a credit to Carillon. The ladies looked very prettily, and were greatly admired. Rev. Geo. Chevreuil, parish priest of St. Anne's, Bout de l'Île, met our Carillon friends and conducted them to our pretty little church, which was splendidly decorated. As they entered the church (to hear Vespers, which was sung by the Rev. Mr. Sauve), a great peal of welcome burst from the organ, which was played by Mr. Mauffette, and the effect was grand, as may well be imagined. Vespers being over, they took a walk through the village, and in a short time went aboard the steamer and left for Carillon.

CORRESPONDENT.  
St. Anne's Bout de l'Île, August 18, 1878.

##### PARTY PROCESSION DAY.

To the Editor of the EVENING POST:

SIR,—Owing to a dispute about whether they should go to Montreal or not, the usual procession of the Orangemen did not take place on the 12th July. The matter having been patched up, they resolved to parade on the 12th August, the anniversary of the closing of the gates of Derry. In order to give the day an official character, the City Council—no heeding the insult they were offering to every Catholic citizen—were mean enough to pander to those bigots and fix this day as a civic holiday. So, in place of the annual civic holiday being a day of pleasure to all, it is this year a day of party triumph. To the credit of our business men be it said that the vast majority of them treated the Mayor's proclamation with contempt, and kept their business places open as usual.

About 10 o'clock the Orangemen began to gather on Princess street, and such a squad! Where, oh where is the glory of Orangism gone? Where were the men of former days? Where were our M.P.'s, ex-M.P.'s and aspiring M.P.'s, our Mayor and ex-Mayors, our Alder-

men and political leaders generally? Where was Sir John McDonald, Max Strange, Drs. McCommon, McKelvey, Drenan, McIntyre and the hundreds of others who used to sport the Orange? Are those men disgusted with the thing, or are they keeping in the shade because of the approaching election? I hope it is the former, but I fear it is the latter cause. The only public man in the ranks was Bill Robinson, M.P.P. In fact each of the Government departments furnished its quota. The Penitentiary gave its deputy warden, John Flanagan, for a grand marshal, besides several of its inferior officers; the Customs Department furnished a deputy marshal in the person of "Woe to Montreal" Tom Robinson, and the Post office furnished two lodge masters in Messrs Dunbar and Smith. In fact, the procession would have been considerably larger if all the Orange Government officials had turned out, but the departmental business would have to be suspended! Will the Montreal Herald take a note of this and advise the Government to let them walk and get some others to fill their situations. At 11 o'clock about four hundred boys and men of the lowest of the Orange Order in Kingston formed into line and started for Portmouth to lay the corner stone of an Orange Hall. The building is about 30 by 30 feet, appropriately situate about half-way between the penitentiary and asylum, and quite convenient to a tavern. The procession was headed by the band of the 47th Volunteers, immediately followed by a banner bearing a likeness of Billy McCommon, of Kingston, butcher, on one side and King Billy, of the Boyne, butcher, on the other. This banner was followed by a number of boys and then came the file and drum band of the 14th Volunteers. You will note that the two bands in the procession are attached to the 14th Volunteers. The first tunes those bands played on starting were "We'll Kick the Pope" and "Croppies Lie Down." On arriving at Portmouth speeches were made in which Popey, Mayor Beaudry and every other man had to take it. The speeches were not much attended to, as most of the boys felt thirsty after their walk and started for the taverns, from which many of them had to be brought home in lunks. Mayor Beaudry is to be honored to-night by torch-light. Of this more anon.

Yours,  
CATARAQUI.

Kingston, August 12.

##### THE TORONTO "TELEGRAM."

To the Editor of the EVENING POST.

SIR,—The Telegram here claims all the privileges of a respectable paper. Of course it does, and is worth with His Grace the Archbishop over the exclusion of its representative on last Wednesday. Would it not be doing mere justice to the public to let them know that the said representative was *Jacky*, and that the letter he presented was a dirty piece of paper, torn in pieces enough to illustrate all the comic sections from the tag end of a sheet of foolscap? SIXTY prominent gentlemen of Toronto were impartial witnesses of this statement.

Yours truly,  
ONE WHO WAS THERE.  
Toronto, August 13, 1878.

##### WHERE WERE THE POLICE?

To the Editor of the EVENING POST:

SIR,—Is the Blake Act for one class of the community, or is it for all? I am inclined to ask this question because I see that after the riots in Ottawa, the Orangemen who returned to Montreal and who took part in those riots were not searched for arms. Where were the police? This is a question which some of our City Fathers should see to. If they were Catholic Union men were returning from such a disturbance, do you think that our worthy Chief of Police would be so negligent of his duty as not to have them searched on their arrival? But if the Blake Act is only to be enforced when Catholics are concerned, then Catholics will learn to challenge it, which could only result in trouble. Again, I notice that Russell, the Young Briton who is out on bail for shooting Harney, was among those who went to Ottawa and who took part in the demonstration. He formed one of the Montreal roughs who went to Ottawa to insult a peaceable people. This is surely going too far. If justice is not at an end Russell should be at once arrested, and no bail should be taken for his appearance. But I suppose the authorities know better, and so I will.

Your obedient servant,  
POLICE.  
(I enclose my card.)  
FATHER CALLAGHAN'S ADDRESS AT  
QUEBEC ON THE OCCASION OF  
THE PILGRIMAGE.

HUSH CATHOLICS OF QUEBEC!—Before giving you my blessing, allow me to address you a few words in the name of the Montreal pilgrims, whom I represent. We have come to-day in a body to worship at the illustrious shrine of St. Ann of Leuven. We have gone to honor Her whose Immaculate Daughter is, of all beings, after our Divine Lord, dearest to the Catholic heart, and to the heart of Catholic Ireland. We have also come from Montreal to proclaim our belief in the grand dogma of the Communion of Saints, a dogma which unites Heaven and Earth, a dogma which binds together two hundred and fifty millions spread over the surface of our globe, a dogma which has created, and still fosters between Montreal and Quebec, sentiments of the noblest, the most generous and most lasting Christian friendship. Between these two cities there exists a union such as perhaps does not exist between any other two cities in the world. It was the spirit of religion, of the dear old religion which has survived the wreck of centuries and human institutions which prompted our pilgrimage from Montreal, and it is the spirit of religion which has given rise to this grand and imposing demonstration which we have witnessed to-day. Quebec enjoys a wide-spread reputation for hospitality, and of this hospitality we have received a public expression upon this occasion. We are proud of and most grateful, Irish Catholics of Quebec, for the magnificent and cordial manner in which you have welcomed us in your midst. Nothing could be more suitable at this moment than to repeat a sentiment embodied in the immortal verses of the bard of Scotland. When Robert Burns was leaving the Highlands of Scotland, where he had been most hospitably entertained, he spoke these words:—

When death's dark stream I'll ferry o'er,  
A time that surely shall come;  
In Heaven itself I'll ask no more  
Than just a Highland welcome.  
If Robert Burns was on this deck in my place, and if he were surrounded by the Montreal pilgrims as I am at the present moment, he would alter these verses somewhat and say:—  
When death's dark stream we (Montrealers) will ferry o'er,  
A time that surely shall come;  
In Heaven itself we'll ask no more,  
Than just a Quebec welcome.

Another skeleton, supposed to be that of one of the fathers who came to Canada about 250 years ago, has been discovered near the entrance of the old Jesuit Barracks now being demolished in Quebec.