

The Times AND Witness

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. XXXVI.—NO. 18.

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 9, 1885.

PRICE—FIVE CENTS.

IRISH HOME RULE

TO BE THE VITAL QUESTION IN THE NEXT IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

WHAT PARNELL HAS TO SAY ON THE SITUATION—HE LOOKS FOR A SETTLEMENT OF THE NATIONALIST QUESTION TO THE LIBERALS—LORD CHURCHILL'S PLAN OF HOME RULE.

LONDON, Dec. 7.—It is stated that Parnell, seeing that the Tories and Parnellites combined, will not be able to deal with the affairs of Ireland, in view of the certain accession of the Irish Tories from the main party on the Irish question, has made overtures to the Liberals. Mr. Parnell, it is said, declares that the Liberal and Parnellites combined can carry everything before them. Mr. Parnell, east division, Mr. Harris, Nationalist, has been elected by 4,865 to 3,392 for A. P. Nugent, Conservative. In Westford, north division, J. E. Redmond, Nationalist, is elected by 6,531 to 517 for Viscount Stopford, Conservative. In Tyrone, south division, Wm. O'Brien, Nationalist, is elected by 3,435 to 3,382 for S. H. Maxwell, Orangeman. This is one of the greatest Nationalist victories of the contest, as it secures to that party the representation of three out of the four divisions of the county. In St. Andrew's the Liberal and Conservative candidates each have 1,255 votes. The vote will be carefully reviewed.

The Press Association announces that it has received information from an authoritative source that the Conservatives have formulated a programme dealing with the education, local government, land and mercantile marine questions. Respecting the Irish question they will probably await Mr. Parnell's views.

THE POSITION OF PARTIES. LONDON, Dec. 7.—Returns received up to three o'clock this afternoon show that 319 Liberals, 245 Conservatives and 73 Nationalists have been elected.

LONDON, Dec. 7.—Mr. Gladstone wrote a letter on Saturday, in which he said: "I am certain that the Tories will be much weaker than the Liberals in the next Parliament as in the past one. It will be impossible for the Tories to conduct a Government on their own strength, or to hold a position of dignity or independence. The Liberal party will outnumber the Tories and Parnellites combined, and will be the only party independent of unworthy motives to court the Parnellites for support."

CHURCHILL'S SCHEME FOR HOME RULE.

LONDON, Dec. 7.—Lord Randolph Churchill has drafted a scheme for Irish home rule, the basis of which, it is reported, is the formation of four provincial councils with a central council at Dublin, to deal with local legislation and taxation, but without power to interfere with tariffs, police or military administration.

PARNELL'S FEELINGS.

CHICAGO, Dec. 7.—Referring to the outcome of the English elections, ex-Congressman Finney said yesterday: "I believe that England will should this coming Parliament exist as long as parliaments usually exist, go to home rule to Ireland. I think it will come out of this next Parliament. If this Parliament fails to pass such a measure, then the Irish people will lose all faith in parliamentary government. England, through her statesmen and her press, has many times said that if Ireland was ever practically unanimous in her demands for self-government it would be granted. She is perfectly unanimous to-day, with the exception of a few opportunists holding about the same relation to Ireland as that the prohibition movement holds to America, but if no such measure should be passed, the very few men in this country and Ireland who most condemn violence will become entirely, or will approve of almost anything which may be done by what is termed the extreme element to annoy and injure England. If the coming Parliament does not grant the demands of Mr. Parnell I will never give further aid for Parliamentary agitation and never take any part or hand in obtaining funds for it, for I will have lost all faith in English Parliaments in reaching a settlement on this question."

PARNELL INTERVIEWED.

NEW YORK, Dec. 7.—The Herald's Dublin correspondent sends the following interview with Mr. Parnell. Having interviewed Mr. Parnell when he was recruiting his forces for the electoral campaign, I have been favored to-day with some of his views, now that his little army is ready for action in the Parliamentary campaign, and now that for the first time in our political history, not one Liberal member crosses the Irish sea bound for St. Stephen's. Replying to my question as to his opinion of the present state and prospects of the two English parties, Mr. Parnell said:—

"It is difficult to predict their numerical position toward each other; but it may safely be said that the Liberals cannot have a majority larger than ten over the Tories and Nationalists combined, while the Tories and Nationalists cannot have more than the same number of votes over the Liberals. Had it not been for the Irish vote in England and Scotland the Liberals would have had a majority over the combination of at least one hundred and twenty. The great lesson we have endeavored to teach all parties is that Ireland will stand no further coercion, and that she desires liberty above all things. I have no doubt this lesson has been learned and will never be forgotten. The so-called Liberal coalition was undertaken simply to bring about contests in all the Irish constituencies, with a view to deplete our treasury and, perhaps, to compel some nominations to fall through owing to lack of funds. American readers should understand that the expense of providing the official machinery and superintendence for holding elections in this country is paid by the candidate. The sum which it was necessary for our candidates to pay to the sheriffs in order to get nominated amounted to no less than £16,000. A

similar sum, of course, had to be found by the Liberal candidates, but this was subscribed by their English sympathizers. Fortunately, the remittances we have been receiving from sympathizers in America during the last two months sufficed us for this purpose, and arrived just in time: otherwise the enemy's calculation might have been verified, and many seats might have been carried by them. The drain thus caused upon our financial resources has, however, been considerable, and funds were never so urgently required as now, since the large majority of members of our party will require help to enable them to give that constant attendance at Westminster which is now absolutely necessary. On the other hand, the recent action of the Liberals in their determined contesting of all seats has afforded

A REMARKABLE DEMONSTRATION of the insignificant nature of their numbers. Outside of Ulster, the city of Cork, and one division of the county and city of Dublin, the totals of the votes polled by them have been comparatively fractional, and do not at all represent the proportion which the Liberals have always claimed to exist between them and the Nationalists. As a rule the polls have shown this proportion to be a few score, or at most a few hundred, to as many thousands of Nationalists. In one case, indeed, the Liberal candidate polled only forty votes to 3,500 cast for his opponent. From this point of view Englishmen must see how completely mistaken was their idea that any but a most insignificant section of the people outside of Ulster were opposed to the Nationalist demand, or that the relative proportions of the creeds represent at all the proportions of political opinions.

With regard to Ulster, we have succeeded very well there, as we carry sixteen and probably seventeen out of thirty-three seats in that province. If we get seventeen we shall have a clear majority of the Ulster seats. We hoped to carry three others—West, Belfast, Derry and North Tyrone—but we just lost them in the very close contests owing to the want of funds some weeks ago to attend to registration and to provide a suitable organization for the elections.

CALCULATIONS CLOSELY REALIZED.

Originally we hoped to carry eighty-eight seats in Ireland and one in England. Our total will certainly be eighty-four, and probably eighty-five in Ireland. If we secure one in England, making eighty-six altogether, we shall have just three only over our original calculation. The Tories will have eighteen or nineteen Irish seats and the Whigs none. You may remember that at the time of our last conversation I thought the Whigs might possibly get two, but certainly not more than four seats. They would have had three by our help; they had not betrayed us in Belfast, Derry and North Tyrone."

A LIBERAL-PARNELLITE COALITION LIKELY.

In former conversations I have indicated that I look for the settlement of the Nationalist question to the Liberals rather than to the Tories. Assuming that Tories and Nationalists combined equal the Liberals, it will be possible for us, by voting with the Liberals, to give them a majority of 170 upon this or any other question—a majority such as no English government has ever had, and one amply sufficient to make up for a score of possible Whig defections. While upon this point I may add that I do not regard the formation of a coalition government as at all likely, or that it would last long if it were formed. There are not a dozen Liberals who, after the recent fierce fight, would consent to coalesce with a Conservative Government against Ireland, and these few voices would be a poor compensation for the transfer of our eighty-five votes to the other side. In short, the settlement of the international question between England and Ireland will be the only vital question before the next Parliament. This vital question may not be settled in that Parliament, but if not it will be put in train for settlement. An early dissolution will leave it to be the issue upon which the next general election must be fought and decided.

RESOLUTIONS FOR RIEL.

THE FRENCH-CANADIANS HOLD A MASS MEETING.

HARTFORD, Dec. 5.—A very large number of French Canadians of Hartford and surrounding towns assembled in a American hall last evening for the purpose of protesting against the execution of Louis Riel. The meeting was presided over by D. J. d'Arche, and Francois Dubout and Louis Labadie were elected vice-presidents. Dr. Caya, of New Hartford, and G. H. Gilbert were elected secretaries. The first speaker was Victor Belanger, who made a long address in which he reviewed the wrongs which the Metis had suffered. Mr. Belanger said that he was under the impression that there were very few French-Canadians in Hartford, but he was delighted to meet such a number as had assembled in the hall. The object of the meeting was not to rescind Riel, but to protest against his execution. He was the victim of a vile crime, and it was but natural for the Canadian residents of the United States to rise up in his behalf and in condemnation of an act which was nothing less than atrocious. And who should we thank for this crime? Sir John Macdonald and three French-Canadian Ministers, Messrs. Chapeau, Langevin and Caron. Although of the same race and religion as Riel, and representing the very people who were in sympathy with him, they had not said a word in objection to his execution. They had looked on and witnessed the deed and had not raised their voices to protest against it. Resolutions protesting against the execution of Riel were then unanimously adopted.

COLLISION ON THE BROOKLYN BRIDGE.

NEW YORK, Dec. 5, 9:30 a.m.—An accident has just occurred on the Brooklyn side of the East River bridge railroad. Two trains came in collision. One man was killed and two or three others had their legs or arms broken. The cars were badly smashed.

MR. ISRAEL TARTE TO THE TORONTO "MAIL."

The Toronto Mail having replied to Mr. Tarte's letter, the latter has published a rejoinder, from which we quote as follows:—

The great interests that are now at stake—a spirit of harmony between races, and, consequently, the maintenance of confederation—give me the right, I believe, of making another effort to prove that you are mistaken on the nature of the agitation that is in progress in this Province. The point which I would like you to share, are that in asking for the commutation of the sentence passed upon Riel, and in protesting against the penalty of death which he had to suffer, the majority of my fellow countrymen have exercised a right which is guaranteed to all of us by the constitution. We might be wrong; but it is our undoubted right to act as we do, the moment we think we are acting justly in so doing. In other terms, the pretension that Lower Canada seeks to put itself above the law because a so-called French Canadian was involved, constitutes a great injustice towards us.

Here is the manner in which you resume your opinion:—

"In a word, Lower Canada set up the doctrine that she had a right to punish the 'executors of the law, whoever they might be for the time being, whenever they suppressed a criminal of whose guilt or sanity she was not absolutely convinced. And the Mail said that it was a proclamation of 'race ascendency that could not be tolerated, 'Kc."

The constitutional doctrine, you know as well as I do, is that the government is but a committee of the house, to which it is bound to account for each and every one of its actions. The execution of Riel is an act of the Government, for which it is responsible to Parliament and the people of Canada. Then it is the undoubted right of any elector to condemn the Government for that act, if he thinks that the said act has been detrimental to public interests.

Sir John A. Macdonald's Government has not done what you say, execute the law; there is no law that obliges it to put Riel to death; it has decided that Riel shall be hung. Read the Statute of the Dominion, 43 Victoria, chapter 25, section 76.

"When any person is convicted of a capital offence and is sentenced to death, the Stipendiary Magistrate shall forward to the Minister of Justice full notes of the evidence with his report upon the case; and the execution shall be postponed from time to time by the Stipendiary Magistrate, if found necessary, until such report is received and the pleasure of the Governor thereon is communicated to the Lieutenant-Governor."

That is what has taken place in Riel's case. Judge Richardson has forwarded his report. The pleasure of the Governor-General-in-Council has been manifested by respites, and finally by the execution of Riel. I repeat it: the law did not oblige the Government to order the execution of Riel; it was in the Government's power to execute or not to execute the prisoner.

It is then evident, and there can be no doubt about it, that you ignore the most elementary principles of responsible Government when you delay us the right of condemning, for Riel's execution. In so doing we do not put ourselves above the law, much less do we wish to proclaim the supremacy of our race over the English element.

We are within our attributions of judges in the last resort of the acts of Government. We are in our right and, excuse me if I tell you so, you are in the wrong when you declare that if we do not set aside our opinions, you will strive to punish us, even if you have to resort to civil war. You would not find in the whole empire a constitutional jurist to defend the theories which you want us to admit.

Our province never asked, never dreamt of asking, that Riel should escape punishment. Condemning as you do the faults of which he has been guilty, we say that the federal authorities have inflicted upon him a penalty which is no more applied by civilized nations to crimes of the kind committed by him, and public opinion inclined to the belief that the Government was not actuated by motives of general interest, and to that is due the deep emotion under the people labored. Under the circumstances of a similar nature, any other Province of the Confederation would have acted in the same way.

I admit that all popular movements are tainted with those inconveniences; some of our orators have spoken inconsiderately, they have never attacked the constitution, nor have they provoked any disparagement of the law of the land.

Your Montreal correspondent has complained of the position in which the English of the Province are placed. That reproach is as painful to my fellow-countrymen as that which accuses us of striving to put ourselves above the law. You will find very few Englishmen of good standing to countenance such a language. We see here what cannot be seen in any of the other provinces: counties exclusively French and Catholic returning members of parliament who are English Protestants. Our English fellow citizens form about a fifth of the population of the Province; yet, of the six ministers which constitute the provincial cabinet, two, Messrs. Lynch and Robertson, are representatives of the English Protestant element. The Irish have one representative in the person of M. Fynn, and the French Canadians have but three English speaking population which is composed of about 250,000 souls, has as many representatives in the cabinet as have the French Canadians who number 1,250,000. How then look like exclusion? If we were disposed to establish what you are pleased to call the supremacy of our race, would we act in such a liberal manner?

The same objection exists in the distribution of public offices. I take the liberty of

laying before you, in your own language, these lines which I wrote some time ago:—

In the following fifteen departments of the Civil Service: The Legislative Council, the Legislative Assembly, the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery, the Law Clerk, the Lieutenant-Governor, the Provincial Secretary, the Registrar, the Attorney-General, the Treasurer, the Accountant, Crown Lands Department, Department of Agriculture, Department of Public Instruction, Railways, Inspection of Public Office, in these fifteen branches of the civil service the salaries of the French Canadian employes amount to \$110,450, while the salaries of the employes of English origin amount to \$42,750. This is to say that our fellow-citizens of British origin draw very near the half of the sum paid to the officers of French-Canadian extraction.

Are these facts and figures of a kind to convince you that in protesting against the action of the government, we had in view the maintenance of that supposed system of domination over the English, and the desire of establishing what the Mail calls the 'tyranny of the minority'?

The only question at issue between us is that of the punishment. I believe that I have on my side the English and American precedents, the ideas that are now current.

On the other hand, you think that the public good and the peculiar circumstances in which the North-West is placed, necessitated that measures of an extraordinary severity be taken. Our opinions are open to discussion. I may be right, you may be wrong and vice versa. If we disagree, let us do so as British citizens, worthy of the institutions which grant us the liberties of speech, of the parliamentary vote and of the press, should do. Do not deny me the right of judging the actions of the councillors of the Crown, as you have already done, as well as the *Critic* has done in the course of a very remarkable article, I admit. It is not the Crown who is involved; it is those who the people have intrusted with the care of advising the Crown. I persist in thinking that a mitigated punishment, though severe, would have best served the interests of our country.

A RECENT VISIT TO LA SALLE'S HOME.

BY JOHN FRASER, MONTREAL. No. 16.

On a bright morning during the month of October last, 1885, the writer was induced by an intelligent stranger of French extraction, from the United States, to join him in a walk to pay a visit to the old home of Robert La Salle, on the Lower Lachine Road. It was a charming morning, clear and bracing, not cold. Autumn was then in her full glory. The frost-tipped leaves of varied hue, which no pencil can paint nor pen adequately describe, allowing a right to the admirer of nature to pause and meditate upon, nowhere to be met with such enjoyable perfection as in this Canada of ours—fittingly pictured by an old writer as—"Sober autumn fading into age."

The reader will remember that La Salle's home is situated on the banks of the St. Lawrence, two miles above the Lachine rapids, at the head entrance of the Montreal waterworks. There are three ways of reaching it: first, by the Lower Lachine road; second, by a walk along the banks of the waterworks; and third, by a walk along the Lachine canal to the Cote St. Paul bridge, thence by a trail through the woods, by an old Indian trail known to few. This brings you to the river front, just at the old home. We took the latter route.

The walk across the rear of Cote St. Paul is a charming one, its cultivated farms with young thriving orchards on most of them, and some looking dwelling houses and substantial farm buildings, denoting comfort. The farm seldom taken; few know of it. It would be a fitting one for our snowshoe rangers. On your right, beneath you, you have the high land of Cote St. Pierre, and then, between the canal and Cote St. Pierre, there is that broad, deep valley, a lake in former days, but now it is the highway for railways, and since it was drained it has become the vegetable garden of Montreal.

In due time, after a walk of two hours and a half, we reached the old home, the Canadian home of Robert de La Salle. The home of the most noted character in Canada history—the home in which he had lived for four years of his early Canadian life. Few of our citizens can hardly realize that this old home, this historical Canadian landmark, is within so short a distance of the city of Montreal and how few of them are aware of its existence, or even of its whereabouts. It is not now "a thing of beauty." It is crumbling down and will soon mix with the dust of ages, but Canadians have it in their power to preserve and restore it as a "joy" and a "remembrance" for all time, that is, if there be public spirit and patriotism enough remaining in Canadians to do so.

"And this is the home of Robert de La Salle!" exclaimed our friend, bowing with deepest reverence and exhibiting feelings of the profoundest veneration as he approached the old building. It was to us a familiar spot, as being enclosed within the old stone wall that at one time surrounded the home of our youth. To satisfy the curiosity of our new friend we entered the building and explored the inside; in doing so we had to be careful of our footsteps. Its echoes and its empty tread called forth thoughts of the noble dead of over two centuries ago, who had lived there, nearly as "Monarch of all I survey," in what was then known as those far Western wilds of Canada. We thought of the time when the "forest primeval" stretched down to the very river edge—when the wolf, the bear and the wild deer roamed nearly undisturbed around this then solitary abode of Canada's most daring explorer.

As we stood in that old building our thoughts were wandering over the bygone centuries of early Canadian days! Not only did we think of La Salle as having lived there, but we recalled the long list of noble men, representatives of old France, who, from time to time, had slept within those venerable—yes, sacred walls! such as Champlain, Maisonneuve, Marquette, Frontenac, Joliette, and a host of others who would, of necessity, have started from this place on their religious pilgrimages or warlike expeditions westwards. Just picture—we were standing on the very same floor on which Champlain and Frontenac had once stood, and within the very walls in which these two noble men had often slept. This is the only building now standing in Canada in which, at one time or another, so many of the daring pioneers, brave soldiers and Christian missionaries of old France had found or sought shelter.

While we were standing and enjoying a peep out of the old window, in the second story in the west end of the building, gazing on all around, taking a present and a retrospective view of what is and what had occurred in and around that old home during the by-gone centuries, just at that time one of our large lake steamers was passing right in front of us, down the St. Lawrence, filled with tourists, to run or jump the Lacinie Rapids—the old Saint St. Louis. We then pictured, in imagination, the time, in those far-off days—when Champlain was induced by the Indians to come up, from where Montreal now stands, to this spot, to have his first run or sail in an Indian canoe over those now far famed rapids!

What a change has taken place since that day! Those rapids still roll on unchanged! such as creation's dawn beheld! They roll now, in the same course! But this old building—the "witness stand" of many a dark tragedy, and the cradle home of many a grand scheme for the aggrandisement of Old France, still stands, as it stood nearly three centuries ago, but now crumbling fast, and soon to mingle with the dust of ages. We turned our eyes to the river front, to what was in the writer's young days a quiet bay—stretching down to where the Water Works bridge now stands. The primeval beauty of this river front is now destroyed by the Water Works basin. A picture of the past, of over two centuries (1681), then rose up before us!

In retrospect—in the days of La Salle—the river front seemed covered with Indian canoes, from their far off hunting grounds, come to exchange their furs. We fancied we saw that band of Seneca Indians with their chief, arrive, and La Salle, robed in his best and most imposing attire, bearing in his hands, aloft, that sacred symbol of his Church—the Cross, in his descent to the river shore, to greet and to welcome the new comers! This was that band of Senecas, with their chief, who remained all winter with him at his home. And, we believe, it was from the information obtained from that Seneca chief which induced La Salle to enter upon those extended explorations westwards and southwards in the Spring time of 1670, never again, we believe, to return to this place.

Although Canadians apparently forget, or do not care to do honor to one of their noblest dead, still the name and the memory of La Salle is preserved and honored in nearly every American town or city from Detroit to the mouth of the Mississippi. Streets and squares in every city and even counties and small villages bear his name, testifying to the respect in which his memory is held. This whole northern continent of America bears unmistakable traces of his footsteps. And, so long as the noble St. Lawrence winds its course seawards, and our vast inland lakes exist as feeders thereof, or the brand and swift Mississippi rolls its mighty waters to the sea, these river banks and these lake shores—if all else were mute—will ever silently testify to the memory of that youthful explorer, La Salle, who first trod or traced their far western or southern shores.

Will not Canadians arise, awake! and do justice to the memory of their greatest explorer?

La Salle needs no monument along our mountain slope! "No storied urn nor animated bust," to perpetuate or to transmit his name to future generations! This whole northern continent—even those unfenced fields—those gardens of this world—boundless and vast, for which the speech of England has no name—the Prairies! Even these, with their countless unfolded herds, ever bear silent testimony to the memory of Robert de La Salle!

What ought to be done with this old home? The writer gave a full description of it in his articles 6 and 7, in the Post of 10th and 20th September, 1885, in which he intimated his intention to set apart 3,500 square feet—say 70 feet fronting on the Lower Lachine Road, by 50 feet in depth, to enclose the old building, provided Canadians were willing to restore and preserve it from falling into decay or from being blotted out of existence! This would be a fitting—the most fitting tribute Canadians could pay to the memory of Robert de La Salle, by restoring and re-building his old Canadian home—the home in which he had lived during the four years of his early Canadian life.

This old building has a history stretching far into and over the by-gone centuries of early Canadian days! Long before the foundation stone was laid in the green city of Montreal, with its now noble structures and princely mansions, the shade of our stately Mount Royal—long before a parish church bell was heard in the ancient town of Ville Marie summoning the little bands of devout worshippers to their early matins—long before those early days of Canadian history did this old building stand, as it now stands, on the banks of the St. Lawrence two miles above the Lachine Rapids.

A Boston man has written an elaborate article to prove that before the close of the next century all of North America, including the British possessions, Mexico and Central America will belong to the United States.

LETTER FROM FATHER COFFEY IN ANSWER TO A CORRESPONDENT OF THE "IRISH CANADIAN."

To the Editor of THE POST:

Sir,—I beg to ask you the favor of publishing the following letter by me addressed on the 4th inst. to the Irish Canadian, Toronto:—

To the Editor of the Irish Canadian:—

Sir,—In your issue of the 3rd inst., there appears a letter signed "A True Irish Catholic." From this communication I take the following:—

THIS POST is following Riel's example, being rebellious to priestly authority, when that authority proves an obstacle to its political chicanery. Therefore THE POST is ignoring Father Dowd's counsel, and has published a letter purporting to be from a distinguished ecclesiastical dignitary, stating that he was opposed to the hanging of Riel because called for by the Orange demon. The letter is wrongly attributed to Archbishop Lynch. If any ecclesiastic of Ontario penned that letter, it must be Rev. Father Coffey, the talented editor of the Catholic Record, whose paper has been trying to fix the onus of the execution of Riel on the Orange influence in the Legislature. Since the snubbing administered by Father Dowd and Mr. Grandin the Catholic Record has "backed down" and taken a good fling at the Orange association."

For the information of your correspondent who, without a shadow of reason, drags my name with his or her letter, and whose sneer at "the talented editor of the Catholic Record," I pass over in the silence of compassion, I may state: 1. That I have had no communication direct or indirect with THE POST on the subject of Riel's death. 2. That the Record has never been snubbed by either Father Dowd or Mr. Grandin. 3. That my views on the subject of Riel's execution are on thorough accord with those of that venerated prelate; and (4) that the Record has not backed down and never will back down from its attitude on the Riel question. Your correspondent states that I have been trying to fix the onus of the execution of Riel on the Orange influence in the Legislature. I regret, sir, that your "True Irish Catholic" did not amplify his or her charge by stating that I have been seeking to fix that onus on Orange influence both within and without the Legislature, that I might plead guilty thereto. To the limited charge I do most willingly enter that plea, and am unsoled to have as companions in misfortune every Irish Catholic journal in the country. Why, sir, did you not yourself, just after the execution, write in those terms:—

"Had the law in the case been allowed to take its course, as in the case of ordinary criminals, Riel might have passed away unnoticed, and might have remained to rankle and fester long after the malefactor had crumbled into clay. But the law was not enough to ensure the doom of Riel—at least the Orangemen thought so—for no sooner was Riel sentenced than the brethren began to fume and fret; and they threatened destruction to the Government of Sir John Macdonald if he did not carry out the sentence of the court. The Orangemen were not so eager to avenge the death of those who had fallen in the late rebellion as they were to avenge the death of their brother, Thomas Scott, who had fallen during the troubles of '69; and Riel having escaped once, they were resolved that he should not escape this time. Hence they kept badgering and hectoring the Premier incessantly; although there was nothing to show that the Premier ever had any other intention than to hang their victim. The impudently late of the Orangemen it was that conjured up the victim's possible escape, and no act or word on the part of Sir John that would justify the suspicion of undue leniency in Riel's behalf. The truth is, the fate of Riel turned on a trial of strength between the French Canadians and the Orangemen, and the Orangemen have won."

In these views, by so clearly expressed, I most heartily concur and believe them to be the honest opinion of ninety-nine out of every hundred Irish Catholics in the Dominion.

Faithfully yours,
JOHN F. COFFEY, Priest.

London, December 5, 1885.

I may add that I do not believe that the correspondent of the Irish Canadian is really a resident of your city—as the letter signed "A True Irish Catholic" bears a most remarkable resemblance to one received at the Record office from Toronto. So clear is the resemblance, that there is in my estimation no mistaking the authorship, which, like that of the letter addressed to the Catholic Record, must in charity be ascribed to a temper not even and of a mind not well balanced.

JOHN F. COFFEY, Priest.
London, Dec. 5, 1885.

PLUNDERING MANDALAY.

THE BURMESH CAPITAL INVESTED WITH RUFIANS.

LONDON, Dec. 4.—A despatch from Mandalay says: Fedder, the minister who is responsible for the Burmese cruelties and intrigues against England, was arrested while trying to escape. There are no Burmese troops at Mandalay. Col Sladen will probably employ the Burmese soldier, who protected the European residents, to form a temporary government.

LONDON, Dec. 5.—Mandalay advises say the rioting there is such as to drive Europeans away from the city. The Dacoits are murdering and robbing with no effort being made to check their lawlessness. They have plundered the Buddhist monasteries and robbed in the open streets the royal princesses of their jewels.

CAIRO, Dec. 4.—Lord Dufferin has sent Charles Edward Bernard, the chief commissioner of British Burma, and a party of Burmese speaking civil officers, to Burma to administer the government.

A "Suicide Club" is the latest oddity in sinful London.