



IRISH RELIGIOUS CON- TROVERSIALISTS.

Lecture Delivered by Mr. Edw. Murphy at the Tenth Public Monthly Conference of the Catholic Literary Academy.

The following is an extended report of the lecture delivered by Mr. Edward Murphy, on Thursday evening, at the tenth public monthly conference of the Literary Academy. The subject chosen by Mr. Murphy was:—

"The Irish Religious Controversialists of the early part of the present century." He said:—I propose in this lecture to offer to the Catholic Young Men's Society a few recollections of the Irish religious controversialists of the early part of the present century, and thereby to call their attention to the important work done by them in enlightening and influencing the public mind of that time in favor of the Catholic religion. I may here remark that in my humble opinion due credit has not yet been given to these devoted men; it is true that notices of them and their works may be found scattered in the various publications of the day, and incidentally in the history of the "Catholic Association of Ireland," but no monograph on their work has as yet appeared in print; this is much to be regretted, and I earnestly hope that the want may be soon supplied. To get some faint idea of the important work achieved by these zealous and devoted men, and the difficulties they had to encounter, I shall say a few words on the state of bondage to which the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland were reduced in the last century at which time "they were actually considered monsters of iniquity, as being outside the pale of salvation, and their souls after death condemned to everlasting perdition." They were in consequence oppressed, persecuted, and despised, and shut out from every position of honor, emolument or trust under the crown. In fact, so crushed and despised were the Catholics at the close of the last century, that the saying passed into a proverb that "Catholics had no rights that Protestants were bound to respect." Such was their state during the whole of the terrible period when they lay prostrate under that "refinement of cruelty," the "Penal Code," of which the great Edmund Burke has said:—"That the Penal Laws were an elaborate contrivance, and as well fitted for the oppression of a people and the debasement in them of human nature itself as ever proceeded from the ingenuity of man."

In connection with the early part of that gloomy period it must be borne in mind that a Catholic dare not write over his own name any thing in defence of his religion or country, no matter how atrocious the calumny might be; any defence of Catholics by themselves in Ireland had to be anonymous, by stealth as it were; for although, thanks to the success of the American Revolution, and its influence on the policy of England towards the close of the last century, the penal laws were somewhat relaxed, still public opinion was so deeply prejudiced against Catholics, and people were so intolerant that few dared face the indirect persecution that was sure to follow, and liberal Protestants such as the immortal Gresham, Edmund Burke, John Philpot Curran, and other large minded and enlightened men of the time, were almost the only defenders the Catholics had during much of that gloomy period of Ireland's history, and we cannot be too grateful to them for the courage with which they defended us in our hour of need, surrounded as they were by anti-Irish and anti-Catholic prejudices and influences, which at that epoch were of the most powerful kind. To dispel the false ideas, so industriously and persistently promulgated against the Catholic religion, number of Catholic clergymen (and even laymen) in the beginning of this century, entered the lists and engaged in religious controversies with some of the leading Protestant divines of the time. I shall only refer to a couple of names, Dr. Doyle, Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin, the celebrated J. K. L., and Father Thomas Maguire, as types of the class of confessors to whom this lecture refers; these devoted men were real confessors of the faith; speaking out boldly and fearlessly they suffered greatly and risked much in defence of Ireland's faith.

On reading about these great men one is struck by the splendid genius of the illustrious Dr. Doyle, acknowledged to have been one of the most powerful and vigorous writers of his day. His profound knowledge of theology, his deep research and universal information, his great logical powers, philosophical mind and originality of thought, not only delighted his co-religionists, but even astonished the statesmen of the day. The impression he made by his powerful writings and his statesmanlike views had much to do in assisting the celebrated O'Connell in his great work of emancipating the Catholics. An eloquent writer, has said of Dr. Doyle that he exhibited the learning, charity and toleration of Fenelon, combined with the heroic independence of St. Thomas A'Becket. [There were many others who took an active part in these controversies, viz., Archbishop McHale (then a young priest), Fathers Maher, McSwenny, Clowry, Nolan, Kinella, England (afterwards Bishop of Charleston, U. S.), Dr. Cahill and others. Among the laymen were O'Connell, Thomas Moore ("Travels of an Irish Gentleman in Search of a Religion"), and Richard Lalor Shillibee.] He was our greatest Irish bishop since the death of the illustrious and patriotic St. Lawrence O'Toole, Archbishop of Dublin in the twelfth century, the last of our canonized saints, but not the last Irish saint in Heaven. One is most impressed by the wonderful powers of Father Maguire, or Father Tom, as he was familiarly called. His extensive knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, theology

and the Fathers; his great memory, quoting off-hand long passages from them; his wit, tact and ready replies to the questions of his adversaries, surprised Protestants, and made him the glory and admiration of the Catholics, who looked upon him with pride, and regarded him as their valiant apologist. I remember reading nearly fifty years ago, with the greatest avidity and interest, some of Dr. Doyle's letters brought from Ireland by my father, and the report of the oral controversy of Father Maguire and the Rev. Mr. Pope in 1827, and was, so to speak, fascinated with them that the impression they have left, even after half a century, is still fresh to my mind.

Before leaving this part of my subject I may say that many Catholics, when they heard Father Maguire had accepted the challenge of Rev. Mr. Pope, a skillful and veteran controversialist, to an oral controversy, they were dismayed that a young Irish priest from an obscure parish in the West of Ireland, should have had the rashness to accept a challenge from such an able and experienced man as the Rev. Mr. Pope, but the young priest, inexperienced as he was supposed to have been, was able for him, and in the great controversy that followed, held in the Rotunda in Dublin, and which lasted several days, Father Tom came off triumphantly victorious. These controversies were often warm, sometimes bitter, and from our standpoint appear very acrimonious, tending to keep alive religious animosities. They had this effect to a certain extent, but, per contra, they did immense good, by attracting the attention of Protestants, and proving to them that Catholics had a solid basis for their faith. Previous to the epoch of these controversies, the generality of Protestants had no idea that Catholics had any better grounds for their religious beliefs than Mahometans, Buddhists or Hindoos. In fact, they believed that the Catholic religion was unscriptural in its nature and teachings, unfit for intelligent, rational beings to follow. But these controversies wrought a great change in public opinion in Ireland and England, the first fruits of which was the passing of Catholic emancipation in 1829, which was followed after a few years by those remarkable conversions to the Catholic faith in England that attracted so much attention 30 or 40 years ago. The controversies referred to had a much greater influence on these conversions than they now get credit for in that country.

It must not be forgotten that Irish bishops and priests in the United States did corresponding good work there in enlightening the American people, the fruits of which are seen to-day in the high position the Catholic Church has attained and the wonderful progress she has made in that country. As illustrations, I shall refer only to a couple of names, viz., Bishop England, of Charleston, S.C., who by his eloquence and the vigor of his writings did so much for Catholicity in the United States. It is worthy of note that he established the first Catholic paper published in the United States, *The Catholic Miscellany*. He published numerous works on religion and controversy, which are still held in high repute; he died in 1842. And Bishop Hughes, of New York, one of the greatest if not the greatest Irish prelate of his day. His far-famed controversy in 1836 with the Rev. Dr. Braconridge stamped him as a controversialist of the first order; this, with his numerous controversial letters and other writings, did a vast amount of good in dispelling the prejudices of Americans against Catholics. These prejudices they inherited from their English forefathers, and to their credit be it said, for the Americans are a liberal minded people open to conviction, they profited by these lessons, with the remarkable results witnessed to-day all over the United States. The ability of Bishop Hughes and his versatile talents as a divine, a statesman, and a controversialist, and also his wonderful endurance were fully displayed during the memorable discussion in 1840 before the City Council of New York and a committee composed of a dozen Protestant ministers, editors and leading citizens, brought against him by the Trustees of the "School Board," specially to defend the then existing common school system of New York, when for three days he sustained against them all the claims of the Catholics of that city for their share of the common school fund. But he was equal to the occasion, and single-handed by his prompt and logical answers to their subtle questions and arguments, silenced and defeated them, expiating at the same time what the teaching of the Catholic Church was, he triumphantly carried the previously hostile council with him and succeeded in getting it to admit the claims of the Catholics of New York to their fair share of the "Public School Fund." This they have enjoyed ever since. Bishop Hughes was a devoted soldier of the Church Militant, able, learned and vigorous—always ready to protect the rights of the Almighty, at that particular time, to do His work in the United States; for it is admitted by all that the organization of the Catholic Church, in that country, was mainly due to his great statesmanship and ability.

The great change in public opinion all over the United States, then, is due to the labors and devotedness of the bishops and priests of our race. The question may be asked now, what would the Catholic Church in the United States to-day be were it not for the Irish race? Through whose instrumentality, under God, such remarkable developments have been made? This lecture would not be complete without a brief reference to the late Father Thomas Burke, O.P., one of the last of Ireland's great army of confessors, who, although not coming within the period of history of which I am writing; yet it will not, I hope, be considered out of place, to say a few words on the work done by him, on an official visit to the United States in 1872 in connection with his illustrious Order when he took up the cause

of Catholic Ireland against the so-called historian, Froude, when that malignant traducer visited America to do England's old work of calumniating the Irish people that country as well as at home; but Father Burke was ready, he met and grappled with him, and by his learned, powerful and eloquent lectures in refutation, exposed the plot, defeated Froude's object and drove him back discredited and disgraced, to those who sent him out to slander the Irish race before the American people.

In this lecture I refer to Irish controversialists only, as the English Catholics, clerical and lay, rich and poor, at that time were but of little account in the struggle; it is true there were a couple of exceptions. Dr. Milner was one of them, but the generality of the English clergy and laity seemed rather to remain silent spectators of the conflict than face the bigoted public opinion of the time. The English Catholics left to the Irish clergy and people—always united may they ever continue so—the arduous work of fighting for Catholic Emancipation and the other concessions obtained from England. The glorious fact remains beyond dispute, that it was the Irish Catholics, alone and unaided, that wrung Catholic Emancipation from England, and thereby gave freedom to the English, as well as themselves, to worship God according to the dictates of conscience.

I beg to ask your kind indulgence for any shortcomings that may be found in this lecture, part of which has been made up of recollections of what I have read of these events at the time of which I treat, as I was being within my own time, which covers a period of over half a century of observation, and what occurred before my day I heard from my venerated father, who was an eye witness of much of the sad effects of the Penal Laws in the latter part of the last and beginning of this century.

One word in conclusion. If I have succeeded in drawing the attention of the Catholic Young Men's Society to the deeply interesting subject of this lecture, and of inducing them to study it, the object I had in view will be fully attained, and, in addition, my own humble acknowledgments as a Catholic will have been made to the "Irish Religious Controversialists" of the early part of the present century; for the incalculable good they did at that period for the cause of religious liberty in Great Britain and Ireland.

A vote of thanks was then moved by J. J. Curran, M.P., seconded by Mr. J. Fosbre, and heartily accorded.

THE DYNAMITE PLOTTERS.

Egan and Daly before the Court—The latter removed to Chester Castle—Mysterious "No. 1" said to be in England.

LONDON, April 27.—Egan, the supposed confederate of Daly, was arraigned at Birmingham yesterday. The crown prosecutor declared that Daly and Egan were accomplices. The police had found a tin containing documents belonging to Egan containing treasonable explanations of the constitution of the Irish Republic; another is a manifesto proclaiming that in case England became involved in war Ireland must rise or the Irish nationality will become a byword and reproach. The brethren are expected to provide themselves with arms to practice shooting and to subscribe money for war materials. The police also found samples of cartridges and arms. The papers found on Daly contained the names and addresses of people in Brooklyn and New York. He asked that Egan be remanded for another week, in order that Daly and Egan could be arraigned together. The request was granted. The tin was found in Egan's garden. In it was a book containing the rules of the brotherhood. Among other things members were required to subscribe threepence monthly for the purchase of war materials, and a penny monthly for working expenses. The centres were to buy war materials and the members to learn to fire well and rapidly. The record showed that the brotherhood had 8,295 old and new rifles and revolvers. The trial of Daly was begun at Liverpool and resumed later in the day at Birkenhead, to which he had been removed. Little progress was made. The prosecution stated that the prisoner when arrested was found to have in his possession bombs of a dangerous kind and materials used in connection with them.

Daly has been removed from Birkenhead to Chester Castle to prevent the possibility of escape. The Paris *Matin* asserts that Tynan (No. 1) is in England, and alleges that the party from whom the information was obtained recently interviewed Tynan in London, who said that behind him was the force before which England would one day tremble. "There are," said Tynan, "men of high position and social and intellectual distinction among the Invincibles. I defy the English Government and its hirelings." An Irishman at Paris states that an emissary of the Clan-na-Gael has arrived in Paris from New York to buy a cruiser provided with torpedoes. Tynan is expected in Paris shortly, where he and O'Casey will direct the dynamite and dagger campaign. An agent of the new party, which aims to unite all patriotic Irishmen, says the party has already considerable funds with which to begin a campaign; with torpedoes provided with torpedoes. Revolving guns will be employed against British men-of-war in various harbors. A second issue of corporation debentures for \$100,000 for the new aqueduct at Quebec is now in the market.

A SCENE IN THE COMMONS.

HEALY ROUSES THE IRE OF THE CHIEF SECRETARY.

Trevelyan gives the Lie from the Treasury Benches.

A STORM OF WILD EXCITEMENT.

The Partisan Ruling of the Speaker.

The British House of Commons was recently made the scene of the wildest confusion and excitement. Mr. Parnell had raised a debate on the police tax in Ireland. Apart from the exposure of the maladministration of the Government officials in Ireland, this might well be remarkable for a scene unparalleled in the modern history of the House of Commons. There have been times of wildest excitement even in this Parliament when the Speaker maintained not merely dignity, but likewise a semblance of impartiality. Gross partisanship was displayed from the chair. Mr. Healy had been speaking with great earnestness about Michael Waters, one of the Crossmaglen prisoners, who died in Mountjoy Prison. The Chief Secretary laughed, whereupon Mr. Healy exclaimed:—

"The Chief Secretary can laugh at the death of this young man. It well becomes him to show this callousness." The Chief Secretary instantly sprang to his feet, and, rushing to the corner of the table, declared in a most excited manner, striking the despatch-box with his clenched hand, "It is an absolute falsehood for the hon. member to say I laughed." The remainder of the sentence was drowned by shouts from the Irish members. The Speaker, without having his attention drawn to Mr. Healy's language, which was certainly violent, but amply justified by the frightful character of the proceeding he was exposing, at once rose and delivered himself of what will, no doubt, be described in the English journals as a dignified and emphatic rebuke, but which was really deprived of all dignity by its venomous tone. A scene of unrestrained excitement took place, which lasted twenty minutes. Mr. Healy throughout maintained the greatest calmness. The Irish members called attention to Mr. Trevelyan's language; but the Speaker with gross partisanship, declined to notice it. Mr. Trevelyan withdrew his statement and then the Speaker, who again challenged to give the ruling, which he did not seem willing to make, stated that the apology had settled the matter, and he thereupon repeated at length his admonition to Mr. Healy. The following is a report of the proceedings.

Mr. Healy asked: Ouid the Government expect reasonable men to look upon this system exposed to-night otherwise than with horror? (Irish cheers.) He could show that whilst one class of men were released from prison, another class were tortured to death. He had the result of a debate which he had raised on the 21st of August last with reference to the unfortunate prisoners charged with the Crossmaglen conspiracy, who had been sentenced to long periods of penal servitude. Aye, and these poor men were a great deal more innocent than some of Her Majesty's Ministers. ("Oh! oh!" One of the men was now lying in his cold grave in Glasnevin, and it was better for him than to be as the others, waiting their lives away in the convict cells of some English prison. He had told them at the time they had released another man belonging to the same batch of prisoners.

Mr. Healy (continuing)—Yes, the Chief Secretary can laugh at the death of this young man. It well becomes him to show this callousness. ("Oh.") The Chief Secretary (springing excitedly from his seat and advancing towards the table)—Sir, that is an absolute falsehood. (Great uproar, and loud and excited cries of "Order" from the Irish benches.) The Speaker—I am bound to interfere. (Ministerial and Opposition cheers.) It appears to me that the hon. member has reached such a high measure of violence throughout the whole of his speech that I feel bound to interfere. He has made charges of the most reckless description, and has charged Her Majesty's Government in language exceeding anything I have ever heard in this House. He has charged them with committing a murder. (Hear, hear, from the Irish benches and cries of "Nams" from Opposition.) He has now made a statement with reference to the Chief Secretary which should not be couched in language which should not be used by one member of this House towards another. (Cheers.) I can only warn the hon. member that if this language is continued I shall resort to those powers which the House has vested me with in order to prevent, in the House, what I can only call a public scandal. (Loud Opposition and Ministerial cheers and counter cheers from the Irish benches.)

Mr. Healy—I rise to a point of order. Mr. Gray—I am raising the point of order, I thought, Mr. Speaker, that you were about to draw the attention of the House to the charge of falsehood made by the Chief Secretary against me. (Loud Irish cheers.) The Speaker—The hon. member is not entitled to enter into any argument with the Chair. (Ministerial and Opposition cheers.)

I have simply done what is my duty to myself and to the House. (Renewed cheers.) Mr. Sexton—I rise to a point of order. (Loud cries of "Order.") Mr. Healy—Then, Mr. Speaker, if I am not entitled to argue with the Chair, I beg to submit a point of order. In the course of my speech the Chief Secretary interrupted me by stating that what I stated was an absolute falsehood, and I was under the impression that you were calling the attention of the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland to the fact that he was not entitled to use the words "absolute falsehood" addressed to an hon. member of this House. (Loud Irish cheers.) Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, you may have overlooked this statement. (Renewed Irish cheers.)

The Attorney-General—My right hon. friend the Chief Secretary was entering into a private conversation with me. Without knowing what the subject of that conversation was the hon. member for Monaghan charged my right hon. friend with smiling with approval at a man having been murdered. (Cries of "No, no," from the Irish members.) What he said was, I believe, that it was all very well for the Chief Secretary to laugh at the murder of an innocent man. Mr. O'Brien—Is not my hon. friend entitled to the ruling of the Chair, and on the point of order he has raised? (Cries of "Order order" and "Hear, hear," from the Irish benches.)

The Attorney-General—I ask for the protection of the Speaker while I explain what gave rise to the incident. Mr. O'Brien again rose amidst loud cries of "Order." The Speaker—The Attorney-General is addressing the House, and is entitled to be heard. The Attorney-General—My right hon. friend and I were in conversation on a matter which had no reference whatever to the debate, and, as my right hon. friend smiled, the hon. member for Monaghan charged him with smiling in approval at the murder of an innocent man. ("No, no," from Mr. Healy.) Hearing such a charge against him, the Chief Secretary, on a natural impulse, jumped up and declared that the statement was untrue. Mr. Trevelyan then rose, but Mr. Healy also rose, as he said, to a point of order. The Speaker—If the hon. member proceeds in this disorderly manner I shall be bound to name him. (Cheers.) Mr. Healy again rose, and there were loud cries of "Chair." Mr. Trevelyan—I wish to say that I used a strong word just now, and I wish to explain how it was I used it. Mr. Sexton here attempted to interpose on a question of order, but The Speaker said—The right hon. gentleman the Chief Secretary is in possession of the House, and must be allowed to proceed. (Cheers.) Mr. Trevelyan—I was saying that I used strong words, and having done so, I claim the right which every member has to explain myself. The hon. member stated, I believe, that I was smiling at what he was saying. I will take the words from him. Mr. Healy—What I stated was that the unfortunate young man was dying in prison, and I naturally supposed that the Chief Secretary was attending to my words. I was stating that this young man died in jail, and I observed a ripple of laughter in the face of the Chief Secretary. I mentioned that, and the Chief Secretary started up and charged me with stating that which was a falsehood. Mr. Trevelyan—I was not in a smiling mood, and anybody who heard the terms in which I was being addressed by another member of the House of Commons would have felt that I had no cause for smiling at the death of an innocent man. I jumped up to emphatically deny that fact, and I do not think that the hon. gentleman himself now believes that I was smiling at the statement he made. Mr. Healy—If you deny it, I certainly do not. Mr. Trevelyan—Exactly so. Then I withdraw the word falsehood. I placed myself in a false position under what I considered great provocation, and I used an unparliamentary expression, which I now desire to withdraw. Mr. Healy—Now, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, on the point I raised, whether that statement of the Chief Secretary was in order? I respectfully ask for a ruling. The Speaker—I understand that the Chief Secretary has withdrawn the expression which he used, on the understanding that the hon. member has withdrawn the expression he made use of. I did express myself in terms of strong reprobation, but not, I think, too strongly with reference to the course pursued for several minutes past by the hon. member. I thought the language he made use of exceeded in violence that which should be permitted, and demanded the reprobation of the Chair, and I took upon myself to warn him, I think, in moderate language that if language such as that he was using were repeated, I should have to take notice of it, and exercise the powers the House has entrusted me with. I shall take no further notice of it now. I consider the point of order settled. Mr. Healy—I am very glad, sir, that you have settled the point of order to your own satisfaction. (Loud cries of "Order" and "Chair.") The Speaker—The language the hon. member used is not respectful to this House. I hesitate to name the hon. member. I am very unwilling to exercise the powers entrusted to me or to appear to act with precipitancy, but I warn the hon. member seriously that that sort of language will not be tolerated. (Loud cheers.) Mr. Healy then proceeded with his speech, as I was saying before this incident occurred, the poor boy lingered on in prison without a sight of the blue sky until the 18th of October. The Governor of Mountjoy

Prison on the 17th June telegraphed that he was dying. He died on the 16th of October. The Home Secretary told us in this House that it was a barbarity and cruelty which could not enter into his nature to keep a man dying in an English prison without releasing him. The name of Michael Waters in Ireland would be a holy name; on the hills of Armagh, where he was known, his name would be treasured as a token of hatred and odium, and would be a war cry amongst the people of the district against their oppressors. His blood rested not upon the head of anybody but the Government. (Cheers from the Irish members.) They took him from his native place, kept him a year and a half in goal without trial; then dragged him to Belfast, and before an Orange Jury convicted him, without even giving him time for his witnesses to be brought up. In the prison books of Belfast they would find the name of the Crown Solicitor and other officials as pretended visitors of this boy placed there to suggest to his friends who might come to him that he had turned informer. It was a wretched trick. They played for the young man's life with loaded dice, and they won the toss. (Cheers from the Irish members.) His corpse was in Glasnevin, but his soul goes marioning on—(a laugh)—and he could tell the Government that the name of this young man, though it might form the subject of laughter to English members—(cheers from the Irish members)—who wept over the slain Arabs of the Sudan—(hear, hear)—that the memory of Michael Waters, of his trial and his sufferings and death, would reverberate through the North of Ireland, and the flame of hatred and oppression which would thus be lighted would spread over the land and of British despotism in the province. (Cheers from the Irish party, followed by cries for the Solicitor-General, but the hon. and learned gentleman did not rise.)

The debate was continued by Mr. Harrington, the Solicitor-General for Ireland, and Mr. T. P. O'Connor.

THE OKA TROUBLES.

Protestants vs. Protestants—Catholics not implicated in the Affair—False Accusations against the latter by the "Witness."

Our pious contemporary, the *Daily Witness*, has made a mountain out of a mole hill, as regards the recent troubles at Oka, and dished up to its readers a lot of accusations against the Catholics of the place for which there is not the slightest foundation. The fight was confined solely to the Protestants themselves, the Catholics having no hand in the *melee*, which originated from the fact that one party of Protestants was in favor of the resident Protestant minister, while another was adverse to him. Up to Saturday day nothing of the sort which was mentioned in last Saturday's *Witness* had been received at the Seminary here, and it is just reasonable to conclude that the false charges made against the Catholics emanated from the puerile brain of a "minion" of the *Witness* establishment.

EXPRESSIONS OF OPINION.

Mr. Robert O. Smith, of the legal firm of Messrs. McLaran, Leek & Smith, stated in a *Post* reporter that the firm had received an urgent telegram from Oka, and in obedience to Mr. McLaran was not in town, took the first opportunity of repairing to the place. He saw Mr. Brubois, the Magistrate, in order to secure his influence to quell any disturbance. He was told by that official that the question of making this new road had not come up in the village council, and any action that had been taken in removing houses had been taken without authority. Mr. Smith found all quiet on his arrival, and so far as he could learn the Catholics sympathized with the Protestant Indians. In his opinion proceedings will be taken in court which will settle this vexed question of title.

Another gentleman stated that this was not by any means a religious question. The Seminary, in his opinion, had perhaps neglected to go through the formula of asking the municipal council for authority, and the petty village magnates felt aggrieved at being overlooked and made a disturbance wholly on olivio grounds. Mr. Dennis Barry said it was a very unfortunate affair that this trouble should have continued so long. Some means should be devised to bring the matter before the Courts and have it settled. The effect of such contests was bad in engendering prejudices and keeping alive animosities which it should be the endeavor of all good citizens to allay, especially in this Province of Quebec.

Another well-known citizen laughed at the idea of there being any feeling in Montreal on the subject. "The *Witness*," he said, "takes these Indians under her wing, and like an exasperating mother-in-law, magnifies every little spot into a battle royal. This journalistic firebrand sent one of its prejudiced foreign reporters full of Presbyterian bigotry, to the scene, with instructions to magnify all he saw and write of a tempest in a teacup as if it had been a western tornado. The scribbler put on his exaggerating spectacles and discovered several mare's nests of huge proportion."

A despatch from Ottawa shows how little substance there is in the *Witness*'s sanguinary story.—"The deputy superintendent of Indian affairs, Mr. Vankoughnet, informed a reporter to-day that the department had no official information regarding the reported trouble at Oka. From private information he learned that the difficulty, which does not appear to amount to much, arose through the Seminary being desirous of removing a church belonging to the Methodist Church minister, so as to allow a road to be constructed there, the church projecting slightly on the line of where the road was to be built. The minister of the church got the Indians to interfere; hence the trouble. Of course this property belongs to the Seminary, there being no reserve."

Mr. Healy—I am very glad, sir, that you have settled the point of order to your own satisfaction. (Loud cries of "Order" and "Chair.") The Speaker—The language the hon. member used is not respectful to this House. I hesitate to name the hon. member. I am very unwilling to exercise the powers entrusted to me or to appear to act with precipitancy, but I warn the hon. member seriously that that sort of language will not be tolerated. (Loud cheers.) Mr. Healy then proceeded with his speech, as I was saying before this incident occurred, the poor boy lingered on in prison without a sight of the blue sky until the 18th of October. The Governor of Mountjoy

Prison on the 17th June telegraphed that he was dying. He died on the 16th of October. The Home Secretary told us in this House that it was a barbarity and cruelty which could not enter into his nature to keep a man dying in an English prison without releasing him. The name of Michael Waters in Ireland would be a holy name; on the hills of Armagh, where he was known, his name would be treasured as a token of hatred and odium, and would be a war cry amongst the people of the district against their oppressors. His blood rested not upon the head of anybody but the Government. (Cheers from the Irish members.) They took him from his native place, kept him a year and a half in goal without trial; then dragged him to Belfast, and before an Orange Jury convicted him, without even giving him time for his witnesses to be brought up. In the prison books of Belfast they would find the name of the Crown Solicitor and other officials as pretended visitors of this boy placed there to suggest to his friends who might come to him that he had turned informer. It was a wretched trick. They played for the young man's life with loaded dice, and they won the toss. (Cheers from the Irish members.) His corpse was in Glasnevin, but his soul goes marioning on—(a laugh)—and he could tell the Government that the name of this young man, though it might form the subject of laughter to English members—(cheers from the Irish members)—who wept over the slain Arabs of the Sudan—(hear, hear)—that the memory of Michael Waters, of his trial and his sufferings and death, would reverberate through the North of Ireland, and the flame of hatred and oppression which would thus be lighted would spread over the land and of British despotism in the province. (Cheers from the Irish party, followed by cries for the Solicitor-General, but the hon. and learned gentleman did not rise.)

The debate was continued by Mr. Harrington, the Solicitor-General for Ireland, and Mr. T. P. O'Connor.