

the sacrilegious pride of the Emperor Napoleon have had their infernal counterpart in the whisperings of Mrs O'Shea—sent as a punishment on Irish offenders against the Holy See—whose transgressions, according to the *London Tablet*, Heaven could not condescend directly to visit—a full measure of justice needs, a much wider extension of the penal eff-ere. These effects, indeed, must be felt in quarters in which the *Tablet* would witness them with dismay. The *Tablet*, in fact, makes an accusation, and, to put it plainly, denounces damnation in a case, that, if his arraignment and sentence are true, constitutes a very grave and wide-spread scandal. All English-speaking Catholicism, in short, with the exception of the anti-Irish section of Catholicism in England, which the *Tablet* so appropriately and virulently represents is compromised in the matter. To be consistent, our contemporary must also rejoice to see the devil let loose against it. And, indeed, to use a homely but expressive phrase, we would not put it past him.

Colonial Notes.

No one can complain that the speech delivered by the Governor at the opening of Parliament on Thursday, the 11th inst, was an empty one. On the contrary, it contained a long and highly debatable programme: The opening up of Crown lands, the acquisition of Native lands for settlement, the repurchasing of private estates, development of the mining industries, reform of the direct taxation, reform of the Legislative Council, an important postal change, bills for consolidating and amending the law relating to electors and elections, and for completing the abolition of plural voting; for classifying and improving the civil service; for amending the law affecting gold mining, and the working of our coal fields; for altering and consolidating the law of bankruptcy; for defining the law of libel; for amending the laws relating to companies and to juries; for fixing the liability of promoters and the directors of companies; and for consolidating and codifying the criminal law, as well as other bills dealing with matters of public interest, and, though last, not least—perhaps, indeed, most important of all, a bill providing for the establishment of boards of conciliation and courts of arbitration, to deal with industrial disputes. Verily the list is a full and goodly one. The speech also contained an enigma: "The elasticity of the Colony's resources has been again shown by a further increase in the already remarkable volume of our exports," said his Excellency, and yet, in the next breath, he had to deplore the unfortunate exodus of population. How does it happen, then, that money is flowing into the Colony while the people are flowing out, and that the increase of products seems inversely proportional to a reduction in the force of producers? The session, however, if we may judge from the Governor's speech, bids fair to be a busy one.

The Address-in-Reply was moved by Mr M'Guire, the new Member for Egmont, and to whom an additional interest attaches as Sir Harry Atkinson's successor. His speech was appropriate and sensible, evidently giving promise of a creditable Parliamentary career. Mr Buick, a member of the labour party, was the seconder. The motion was carried without unnecessary debate.

What does Mr Fisher mean by that question of his, if the Government will introduce Mr Pyke's Private School Bill, or some cognate measure? Are we to look upon Mr Fisher as a newly acquired ally? If so he will be heartily welcome, and some of our opponents will be a good deal mortified. Or can it be that Mr Fisher's motive is that of embarrassing the Government. He has grievously taken to heart his rejection as Chairman of Committees. He has in fact, publicly threatened vengeance. "The party in quite a gratuitous way has put upon me an affront," he writes in a letter to a contemporary, "and that affront the party will expiate. There is no nonsense about me in a matter of this kind." Can it be that Mr Fisher's intention is to put the Government by forcing them to make a declaration which will place them in a dilemma, obliging them either to sacrifice the support of the secularists or to incur the necessary opposition of the denominational party? We do not know what Mr Fisher's meaning is. We hope it may not be sinister, but, if this is the manner in which he understands his parliamentary duties and is prepared to fulfil them, all we can say, speaking of course in a strictly metaphorical and political kind of way, is, that he deserves to be whipped at the tail of a cart, a good old punishment reserved for offenders of a particularly mean and despicable type.

The Secretary of State supports the Governor, as we said he would, in the matter of the appointments to the Legislative Council. His reply is that His Excellency acted strictly in accordance with the constitution of the colony. He however, adds a saving clause to the effect that he offers no opinion as to the action of the defeated Ministry. We understand, nevertheless, that a Tory manoeuvre receives a necessary support from the head-quarters of Toryism.

Our contemporary, the *Globe*, makes a loud condemnation of a proposal put forward by the U.S.S. Company for the formation of a Mutual Benefit Society, of which the men at present in their employment should voluntarily become members, but whose membership would be obligatory on all future employees. The proposal undoubtedly does seem something like an attempt on the part of the Company to obtain an unfair hold on the men and to bind them by ties which it would be more difficult for them to break. Some of the rules are of a nature that seems calculated to place the members more in the power of their employers than they would otherwise be. It may, for example, seem reasonable to decree that a member should be expelled for disorderly, drunken, or immoral conduct, but the epithet "disorderly" at least is capable of various interpretations. That a member should forfeit his subscriptions and rights again, on leaving the service of the company without the consent of the authorities, seems a rather doubtful requirement. It might be better for men to join societies where no such restriction would be placed upon their liberties, and whose benefits would not be bound up with their continuance in any particular employment. The complaint of the *Globe*, moreover, to the effect that the interests of friendly societies are threatened by this proposal seems justified. The men who subscribe to the society in question, whether voluntarily or by compulsion, will necessarily be lost to them. No doubt the Company mean well by their project. It is, however, open to question as to whether any more peaceful solution of the labour difficulty is to be found in shackling the working men even with gilded fetters, especially if it be done because they cannot help themselves. We may doubt, besides, as to whether the Union Company have acted over wisely in betraying the fear that this proposal certainly seems to bespeak.

New Zealand bids fair to heaven the colonies with fads. A Mr J. M. Haslett, for instance, who has just been defeated in an election for the Zeehan district of Tasmania came forward as an advocate of education, free, secular, and compulsory, and of the nationalisation of the land. Mr Haslett's more sane pretensions were those of a representative of the mining interests with which the district is especially associated. Tasmania, however, does not seem as yet ripe for the adoption of fads, and consequently the more legitimate object suffered. Mr Haslett appealed to his friends to testify if he had not always employed the best men, and paid the highest wages in New Zealand. Such being the case it is a pity we lost him—and a man or two, more or less, beset by fads could make no great difference to us here.

Lord Jersey, Governor of New South Wales, spoke a sensible word or two during a visit paid by him the other day to St. Ignatius' College, Riverview. In replying to an address presented to him his Excellency alluded pointedly to the nature of the education given in the institution—"an education," he said, "grounded on religion, which is the foundation of all true culture."

A warning to burglars has occurred near Sydney where a man, supposed to have been a member of the brotherhood, was found the other morning smothered in a chimney. Some modification of suspicion is, however, possible, owing to the fact that the chimney was that of a refreshment room, into which an unfortunate fellow might have been attempting an entrance to ease his hunger. In any case burglars had better try some safer way.

In alluding to an action recently tried in Melbourne the *Advocate* asks a pertinent question or two:—"In the course of the trial" says our contemporary, "it was suggested that the plaintiff had violated a Masonic rule in bringing his complaint before a civil tribunal instead of before the Masonic lodge of which both parties were members. Referring to that feature of the case, Mr Justice Hodges said, in his summing up, that no matter how grossly the rules of the Masonic body were violated they could not prevent any man coming with a grievance to a court of law. Of course not; but can the Masonic Lodge inflict a penalty on the offending member, and is he amenable to its jurisdiction? Has the Lodge the power to punish him for exercising his civil rights, and is he bound by oath or fear of consequences to submit to its decision? When it became known a few years past that the Chinese had a court of their own, to which disputes among themselves were carried for settlement, and that this court inflicted fines on wrongdoers, there was a great outcry against this *imperium in imperio* on a small scale. Is the same thing on a somewhat higher scale among Freemasons to be altogether overlooked? The Chinese Court was regarded as a sign of alienation from the common interests and an offence to our established institutions. The Masonic Court is an analogous case, and have those who censured the Chinamen nothing to say against the Masons?"

In view of the resolution of the labour party to fight their cause in Parliament, a committee of employers, entitled the Electoral Registration Society, has been formed in Melbourne to secure that the names of voters of the right class are placed upon the rolls. The