

tions regarded with affection and followed with pride as their natural leaders. An impression has been produced by Lord Mayo's prosecutions, and some of their later incidents, which it will be extremely difficult to remove, and which, if not removed, will tell upon the next elections in the province, perhaps injuriously. It is certain that such men as spoke on the Belfast workingmen's platform are not to be despised. Their opinions are intelligently formed, and with a reference to the actual position of events.— Their conviction is shared by the calmest thinkers, that there will not be peace in Ulster, or in Ireland, so long as the Party Processions Act remains on the statute-book.

The state of public feeling is so far understood, that there appears to be a wish to release the Downpatrick prisoner at the earliest moment, on any fair reason. It was stated by the Belfast papers that Mr. Johnston had been liberated. The announcement was premature, and indicated a remarkable anxiety in a certain class of prints to be able to say that he was a free man again.

[From the Derry Sentinel, March 7th.]

Few can have any doubt of the real character of the processions at Cork, Limerick, and Dublin. When Lord Derby stated, in a speech in the House of Lords, that the Cork and Limerick processions were within the law, and when Lord Mayo, in the House of Commons, expressed doubts of their legality—when the Dublin procession was not prohibited, although due notice was given of it—the parties composing it cannot be blamed for holding it. But the practical injustice remains that loyal men are punished, while others who cherish various shades of disaffection escape. It is the course that is pursued by the Irish government that is to blame.

As a Liberal Government he took no notice of three former illegal proceedings, as a Conservative Government have taken no notice of the Cork and Limerick processions to the present hour, while the Dublin prosecutions was a tardy proceeding, taken up after the accused parties had been supplied with an admirable defence. If real impartiality was intended, especially after the failure of the Dublin prosecutions, the prosecutions at Down should have been withdrawn. That course was urged upon the government, but in vain. At first it was announced that the Attorney-General was to be in Parliament, but as Parliament was adjourned at the time, it was necessary for him, as a matter of common decency, to attend at Downpatrick. Yet there was no withdrawal of the prosecutions. There may have been a tacit understanding with the Crown prosecutions as to the pleas of guilty, but it was an arrangement to which honourable men could not consent. The Attorney-General, it is true, stated that he did not come to prosecute the Orangemen, but such a statement was a paltry verbal quibble. The set-off of the Rathfriland Roman Catholics was only made use of to give a colour to the profession of impartiality that is now set up.

No attempt has yet been made to try the Cork and Limerick processionists. The Dublin processionists were only tried after a good defence was supplied them by leading members of the government itself. Why is this foolish act kept upon the Statute book? Why is it enforced against loyal Protestants, when it either is not, or cannot, be enforced against men whom it would be a libel to call loyal? If all Acts of Parliament are to be scrupulously obeyed government should set the example. It is notorious that the Ecclesiastical Titles Act is allowed to remain a