Huron Signal.

GODERICH, NOV. 1, 1866.

The Trial of the Fenian Prisoners.

Large Concourse of Spectators.

Col. Lynch and Peter McMahon found Guilty!

They are Sentenced to Death!

PARTICULARS OF THE TRIALS!

The Trials of the Fenian prisoners captured at Fort Erie in June last commenced at the York and Peel Assizes, which opened in Toronto, before Mr. Justice John Wilson, at noon on Wednesday last. The character of the crimes charged against the prisoners drew a large crowd of citizens to watch the proceedings with deep interest. In default of not being able to give a full report of the trials, which have filled the daily papers from day to day, we propose to give the facts in a shape suitable to the limited space at our command.

Robert B Lynch—said to be a Fenian Colonel, was the first placed in the dock. Mr. Martin appearing for the defence and Hon. J. H. Cameron for the prosecution. In forming the jury twelve persons were challenged. The following panel was at last completed:

Abner S. Gould, of East Gwillimbury;
John Clarke, of York;
Daniel McDonald, of King;
John M. Bair, of Scarboro;
Charles Fry, of King;
Thomas Marston, of Markham;
Oliver Lunday, of Gwillimbury;
Roderick McLeod, of Vaughan;
Philip Gowler, of Whitchurch;
George Garrow, of King;
George Granger, of York; and
Wm. Corner, of Georgina.

The indictment was then read, and the witnesses for the crown ordered to retire to an adjoining room. Mr. Cameron opened the case for the crown in a very lengthy address to the jury. James Severs, in charge of the old jail, where the prisoners were kept, identified two letters as having been handed him on the 4th and 20th of July last. These letters, being read in Court, showed that they were written by Lynch, and proved that he was with the Fenian expedition in the alleged capacity of a newspaper correspondent. Thos. Newbiggin, of Fort Erie, testified that he went to the Fenian camp about 3 o'clock on Friday the 1st of June last to recover some horses belonging to his father which they had taken. On asking if he could see Col. Hoy or General O'Neil, he was told that Hoy was at Fort Erie, but he could see O'Neil, and referred him to Col. Lynch, the prisoner at the bar. He saw Lynch, who referred him to O'Neil's adjutant. Lynch wore civilian's clothing but had a sword suspended at his side by a belt around his waist. "I addressed him as Col. Lynch and he answered without correcting me." The rest of the evidence is in proof of the belligerent attitude of the Fenians, and their hostile intentions, Arthur Molesworth said "I recognise the prisoner as one whom I saw with the Fenians on the morning of the 1st of June. He was just behind them as they were going up to the village. He was armed with a sword in a steel scabbard suspended from a belt around his waist. He was talking with a man whom I knew lived across the river, and I overheard a part of the conversation. This man said to the prisoner that his son had joined the Fenians, and he wanted him to take care of him. Lynch said that he would. The men who were marching were armed with rifles and bayonets. They numbered, I judged, about fifteen hundred, walking four abreast I saw some of them landing.

Joseph Stephens, I reside at Fort Erie and was in that neighborhood on the 1st of June last. I saw the prisoner there on that day. When I saw him first he was on the road getting his men in line to march. He was armed with a sword, but nothing else that I observed. He seemed to be in command of others. They had taken myself and others prisoners, and when he got his men into line we were ordered to fall into the ranks. I was about fifteen or twenty minutes in custody, and was in his presence during that time. After he had marched us about three-quarters of a mile along the river bank he dismissed us. I did not hear any particular conversation among the men. Some of them were rather easy. (Laughter.) They said they were going to Toronto and Quebec. One of them asked me how far it was across to Canada—whether it was twenty miles, and I said I thought it was about seven. (Laughter.)—They said they had come to take Canada, and when they had done it each of them was to have a good farm. (Renewed laughter. I saw them all day marching around. I was held as a prisoner all day, with a guard over me and my house."

Thomas Molesworth sworn—I reside at Fort Erie, and am the father of the second but last witness. I saw the prisoner on the morning of the 1st of June, and he had arms on him. I saw him Saturday some time in the forenoon about 11 or 12 o'clock. He spoke to me. Some one said on Sunday that he was a Fenian and he replied that he was a reporter for a paper, and that was the reason he was with them. This conversation took place about the time he was arrested. I have no doubt this is the same person I then saw.

Wm. Murray, sworn—I have seen the prisoner before. I saw him on Friday, June 1st, about a mile and a half below Fort Erie. He was standing with several others, who were armed. The prisoner had a sword by his side. I saw him in the afternoon a little down the river in company with others. He was then armed with a sword. I saw them when they landed, and I then went to the telegraph office. I am in the custom house. I was at the fence of the camping grounds. They appeared to be about 900 or 1,000 strong. They were all armed, and had flags and drums and bayonets.

Thos. Ryle, (who turned Queen's evidence,) testified as follows:—

Thomas Ryle sworn—I was at Fort Erie on the first of June last. I came from Buffalo. I came over early in the morning in a canal boat drawn by a tug. There were perhaps about three hundred on board of her. We walked down from Buffalo to Black Rock. When we left land on the American side the man had no arms. Ammunition was served out on the American side, but after we left the shore arms were issued out to the men. Guns and bayonets were issued out. When we landed on the Canadian side there was ammunition in boxes but I did not see arms in boxes. They said they were coming over to take Canada; that was their intention I believe. I saw Col. Lynch in the morning at Fort Erie. He had a sword, and was walking up and down among the men. About four o'clock we left Frenchman's Creek, and about 100 were sent out as skirmishers. We then waited till the main body came up, after which we then marched into the country about six o'clock. I then left. A captain came galloping up and said we were going into action. I then stepped aside and several others did the same thing. (Laughter.) I then went down to Colonel Peacocke's farm. The Fenians were about 800 men strong, I did not see the prisoner in the afternoon.

It being 6 o'clock at this point of the proceedings His Lordship adjourned the Court until 10 o'clock next morning.

On Tuesday morning the evidence for the defence was entered into. The evidence was very lame, being confined to an attempt to prove that prisoner was an unarmed newspaper correspondent. The mother of Ryle, the Queen's evidence, gave that youth a very doubtful character. She said:—

I am sure and certain he ought not to be believed. I am 15 years in America. My son came to America when 8 years old. He was with ourselves a long time. When not very old he was able to earn $6 a month. He lived with us first at Capetown, near Dundas, 3 years. From there I removed to Paris, and spent another year there; from that place we went to Guelph, and live close to Guelph yet. He must have been about 4 years with us in Guelph. He left for the United States a couple years ago, and once before that he was over there also, and came back with no great welcome before him. Last April twelve months he cleared away, and heard nothing about him till we got a letter from the Sheriff that he was taken with the Fenians. He did not come to America within a year On my oath I would never believe his word any more than his oath.

The prisoner's counsel addressed the Jury at great length, and was followed by the Solicitor General, after which the learned Judge delivered the following charge:

THE JUDGE'S CHARGE.

His Lordship then proceeded to charge the jury. After reminding them that they had nothing to do with the consequences that might follow their verdict, he said that this case presented little more difficulty than any other criminal trials. The crown set up a certain theory set up by facts; that theory and those facts were disputed by the defence. The crown alleged that war had been levied upon Her Majesty by certain unlawfully armed men; that the prisoner was among those men, either armed like themselves or giving them countenance and encouragement The crown, moreover, undertook to identify him as one who had command amongst them. The theory of the defence was that the crown was mistaken in the man; that he was not the person alleged to have had command, and that he was not there at the time charged. The circumstances that had been established by the crown in evidence were such as constituted the levying of war against Her Majesty. That was the first point disposed of. The next was whether the prisoner was in command of the parties who thus levied war against Her Majesty. What was the evidence on that point? They had first the statement of Mr. Newbigging, who seemed to be a very intelligent man, and who, without any apparent exaggeration, gave a very clear and distinct account of the affair. His Lordship analyzed the statements made by this witness, and said it was for the jury to judge whether they were worthy of acceptation or not. He then referred to the evidence of the Molesworth's, father and son, who, like Mr. Newbiggin, distinctly swore to the prisoner as being the person whom they saw in command at Fort Erie. He next adverted to the evidence of Stephens, who swore to the same effect, and then he referred to a claim made by the prisoner in his letter that he was an American citizen. With regard to this question of citizenship, it had once led, he said, to very serious results; and although the theory of our law was that a man who once became a British subject was always a British subject, the practice had latterly grown up for the crown not to prevent its subjects from becoming citizens of another country, or to punish them for throwing off their allegiance. The Crown allowed its subjects to become naturalized in another country without prejudice, and so far to relieve themselves from the allegiance they owed as subjects. In this case the crown had a right to try the prisoner as a British subject, but as he had chosen to throw off his allegiance, the crown said, as it had a right to say, "Well and good, we will treat you as an American citizen." The prisoner alleged that he had not come to this country to levy war, but for another and a peaceful purpose; and it was stated further that he was not present at the place where war was levied at the time that he was alleged to have been seen there by the witness for the Crown. His Lordship examined the evidences that had been given by the defence to sustain this statement, and pointed out the difference between the cabman Cooney's statement and that of the witness Cormick, saying that one or other of them must be mistaken. If Cormick was right, then his statement corroborated the case for the crown. If Cooney was right then his idea as to the time he saw the prisoner in Buffalo was against, not only a witness who was called for the defence, but also against the witnesses for the crown, who stated that they saw the prisoner at Fort Erie, and marching from there down the river, between 8 and 9 o'clock in the morning. It was for the jury to say whether they believed the cabman when he said that he drove the prisoner to Black Rock at noon, or to assume that he was mistaken in making that statement. The defence suggested that the person seen by the witnesses for the crown at Fort Erie was not the prisoner, but some man whose name was unknown, but who was called "Captain," and was said to have come from Indianapolis. It was suggested that this man resembled the prisoner, but that the witnesses were mistaken in assuming it to be him. The jury would have to decide whether this theory could be reconciled with the facts testified on oath. Then with regard to the statement that the prisoner was a reporter, and that he was taking notes without being armed with a sword or otherwise, the jury would consider whether it was not possible for him to have been in command of the invaders, and to have done the work of a reporter as well. But supposing that he was there as a reporter, and not bearing arms, if it was a fact that he was there in furtherence of the objects of those who had been armed, if he aided and abetted in the accomplishment of their designs, then the law would hold him to be just as guilty as if he had actually arms in his hands. If he were there by accident as a mere stranger to them, then it would be very proper to consider whether it would be fair to charge him in connection with their acts; but a man could occupy no such equivocal position as that in an affair of that kind. The law would not recognize him as a neutral—if he was there associated with them he became amenable to all the consequences of what they did. If he was there to aid and comfort them in any way whatever—as a spiritual adviser even, or a medical man, or in any capacity which gave them encouragement or aid—even although he did not bear arms—the law made no destinction between him or any others who merely assisted about the camp and those who actually had arms. The law held all to be equally guilty. He (the learned Judge) had occasion at an earlier period of this assizes to explain to the grand jury the law upon this point, and it was, perhaps, hardly necessary for him now to refer again so minutely to it. If three or four men conspire together to kill another, and if one of them watched while the others committed the deed, the one was just as guilty as they who actually shed the murdered man's blood. Again, if a party of men came to rob a house, and if some of them entered to commit the robbery and the others remained outside to give warning if necessary, those who remained outside were held to be just as guilty of the robbery as those who entered to carry it out. This was the principle of law in all enterprises of that kind. There could be no distinction between those who actually committed the crime, and those who by their presence and counsel, gave aid and encouragement to its commission. A man could not stand neutral when a notorious act was being committed. He must either help the perpetrators or he must dissuade them from the act, and if he could not dissuade them he should no longer stay there. Well, in this case of the prisoner, he went there as a reporter, he was there innocently. These men had gone there on an unlawful enterprise, and being there with them the prisoner was either for them or against them, just as the evidence would bear out. It could hardly be supposed that he was there in an unfriendly attitude to them, but rather to aid them by the statements he would make in regard to their acts; for did any one believe that they would have allowed him to remain in their camp, if they believed that he was there for a purpose prejudicial to themselves—if, for instance, he was there to report to the government of this country the acts which those men were committing. It was clear that they did not treat him in the same in which newspaper reporters usually claimed immunity—namely, on the ground that he intended to report fairly and impartially what had occurred, for in that case he would have had to make declarations which would not have conveyed an approval of those proceedings, but would rather have caused them to desist from their unlawful undertaking.

His Lordship repeated to the jury the statement made by Whalen, and then went on to say, that if the jury found the prisoner was there, although even as a reporter, in furtherence of the scheme the band had in view, then he was there aiding the enterprise just as much, and probably more effectually, than any one who was in arms.

The Jury retired at 10 minutes past 4, and returned at 6,25 with a verdict of *Guilty.*—

The Solicitor-General rose and said—I move, my lord for the judgment of the Court on the prisoner.

His Lordship—Robert B. Lynch, have you anything to say why the sentence of the Court should not be pronounced on you for this felony?

PRISONER'S ADDRESS.

Prisoner, with a firm voice, replied as follows:—Well, my lord, you must be aware—you must have noticed—the inconvenience and disadvantage my counsel laboured under in not being able to bring forward the evidence of those who could have proved clearly that I had no connection with the Fenian raids. I state now that I had neither hand, act nor part in the late invasion and that I came to Canada not in the capacity in which it has been represented I came, but simply as the correspondent of a public journal. And in so doing, I was not aware that I violated either the laws of Canada or those of my adopted country. I was not aware there could be any objection to a reporter following the army, and chronicling the incidents and progress of the invasion. Had I known this, I would have been careful to have remained on the other side. With regard to the manner in which the Crown has conducted the prosecution in my case, I think and must confess that I have been very fairly dealt with. Both the Crown Solicitor and Mr. Cameron have carried on the prosecution in the most fair and impartial manner; and I feel that it is but right in me to make the statement.

His Lordship—The object in asking you to address the Court was to give you an opportunity of urging any legal objections, if you had them. It is too late now to discuss the facts of the case.

Prisoner,—Well, my lord, you must be aware, with regard to legal objections, that I am not cognizant enough of law to make any. I only know that I am innocent of the crime charged against me, and of which I have been found guilty. And I here pledge myself before that God, in whose presence I must—appear some day, that I am wholly innocent of the crimes for which I was brought here; and that I never saw Stephens till I was arrested and brought into his very house on the 2nd of June. On that occasion I saw him, when placed in his house, for a short time previous to being brought up to the Court House.

The Crier then made the usual proclamation prior to passing sentence of death.

SENTENCE OF DEATH.

His Lordship, addressing the prisoner, said—I am very sorry to find a man of your age and experience stand where you do to-day. You are a man who must have seen a good deal of the world—a man not without education and intelligence. The evidence brought before the Court is perfectly clear and conclusive that you were not in Canada as a reporter on the occasions charged in the indictment; but that you were armed and in some kind of command. What that was does not distinctly appear.—But even though you were there only as a reporter, you ought to have known that no war had been proclaimed with those men with whom you were seen marching as atrocious, almost unparalleled, invasion on a peaceful country, and that under the circumstances you were there to report the ravages of these men to others interested, in order that they might gloat and glory over the slain. While a single word would have in finence the case in your projected, I carefully abstained from saying anything against you But it does not now lie on me to extenuate your fault or affect not to see it in its darkest light. You professed, with others, to redress the grievances of centuries—to right the wrongs of an oppressed people—and to remove the iron heel which you say the Saxon put on the Celt centuries ago; and yet you began by unlawfully invading a country with which you complain. Why should your iron tread be forced on you? Why should our homes be desolated and our young men be slain by you? Will any man of sense answer this plain question? Was it less than murder for you to come here in the dead of night to invade a country and slay our people? And all this was done under colour of relieving Ireland! Could any right you may have somewhere you to commit such a wrong as you have perpetrated? You is putting your case in a very plain and clear light. You stand here surrounded by the friends and relatives of the men you slew on that occasion. If you were there as a reporter even, you were not guiless. Your object was to encourage others to come if these men had been successful; or keep them away if the reverse had happened. Looking at your conduct in that light, you cannot be surprised that the law should be enforced and that you should suffer the dread penalty of that law—a I very much fear you will—for how could we punish the young, reckless and unthinking young men to be brought here for trial—who followed such as you, and placed confidence in you, if you were to be allowed to escape? Could you see any justice in punishing them in such a case? You complain unjustly that those who were in command on that occasion were not allowed to come here to give testimony in your behalf. But it cannot pervert the law, and the Crown cannot overrule it. If the Crown had given any such pledge of safe conduct as had been spoken of, it could not be carried out. You have had all the justice you could possibly get, and have had every advantage of the form of law. Every one also abstained from urging too hardly against you that which might have been urged. But I would fail in my duty now if I did not put your crime in its true light which should to sentence you to appear before that Judge who sees things not as they are It is a very painful thing, the most painful which a man can be called on to do, to doom a fellow-man to death. But the requirements of society urge it on me. The law requires I should not shrink from it; if I could I would. As the law now stands, you might be sentenced to immediate execution. The law puts that discretion in my hands. But inasmuch as that is an ex post facto one as to you. I shall certainly not exercise any discretion I may have to shorten your existance one hour. Moreover, you have a right to bring into the whole case—to appeal from the decision of a Court adverse to you—if there was anything wrong in the proceedings; and God forbid that I should deprive you of that opportunity to appeal. You shall be treated just as the law was when you committed the offence; so that, if the evidence does not, in the opinion of my learned brethren, sustain the conviction, time and opportunity will be given you to move against it. If I have received evidence such as I ought not, or have put a wrong construction on any part of it, it will be open for you to make complaint to that effect; and the period of your execution will be delayed till the end of next term, just as if that law had not been passed, so as to afford you an opportunity of appeal. It now only remains for me to pronounce the dread sentence of the law. Yours is an offence punishable with death. I can exercise no discretion. The sentence of the Court on you, therefore, is that you be taken to the place from whence you came, to be there detained till Thursday, the 13th day of December next and to be taken from thence on that day to the place of execution, and there hung by the neck until you are dead, and may God have mercy on your soul.

During the latter part of his Lordship's address, he was deeply affected and could scarcely proceed with the sentence. The vast audience in the Court were hushed as still as death itself. But, to all outward appearance, the prisoner remained unmoved. Not that his indifference appeared stoical; but he looked as if he had nerved himself to encounter the trying scene.

TRIAL AND SENTENCE OF 'FATHER' M'MAHON.

On Friday the case of Rev. D L Lumsden was called, but, on application of prisoner's counsel, the case was postponed for one week. The Rev. John McMahon was then placed in the dock. The indictment contained three counts: 1st that he was an American citizen, and as such entered into Upper Canada with intent to levy war, in conjunction with sundry other evil disposed persons. In the second count, it was charged that he unlawfully continued in Canada in arms; and thirdly, that while there, with other evil disposed persons, he committed an act of hostility, with intent to levy war. The indictment was framed under a statute in force in Upper Canada, since at all events, 1840.

The case for the crown was opened by Mr R A Harrison, Mr M C Cameron appearing for the defence. Eleven or twelve witnesses were called for the prosecution. They proved that the prisoner was with the Fenian force in the alleged capacity of a priest, to bury the dead, &c., and that besides being, apparently, on very intimate terms with them, he carried a revolver at his side. No witnesses were called for the defence, Mr Cameron contenting himself with delivering one of his most eloquent speeches. After explaining the law upon the case, carefully, as in the case of Lynch, His Lordship read over the evidence of the various witnesses and directed the jury to retire and deliberate calmly as to their verdict. The jury retired, and in 45 minutes returned with a verdict of GUILTY.

Hon. J R Cameron moved for the sentence of the Court upon the prisoner.

His Lordship asked the prisoner if he had anything to say why sentence of death should not be passed upon him,

THE PRISONER'S REMARKS.

The prisoner spoke briefly in a somewhat excited manner, and a voice broken from emotion and a natural defect in his utterance. He said that before God and the world he was not guilty. At the time that Milligan and Sullivan said he was in Fort Erie, before God and those present he was in Buffalo. He was busoiglty on his journey to Montreal, and was not guilty. If guilty, he would have submitted; but his blood would cry for vengeance on those who had taken away his life. He left home on the 30th of May last to go on a journey to Montreal. He went on the cars at 8 o'clock and arrived in Buffalo at 10 o'clock on Thursday night, the 31st of May. He stopped at the Franklin House all night, and had breakfast there. In the morning he visited friends named Vaughan. He crossed the river by the ferryboat at 7 o'clock, on his way to Montreal. He lost his way there through excitement. Here the prisoner stopped, apparently broken down, and gave no explanation of his course on the Canada side.

SENTENCE OF DEATH.

The crier made the usual proclamation that all should keep silence while the sentence of death was being pronounced, and the Judge proceeded to address the prisoner as follows:—

John McMahon.—The Jury have found you guilty upon evidence which I think admits of no doubt that you were present with those people and lent them all the countenance and assistance in your power, is very clear; and it is a pity that a clergyman of your church, which upon all occasions has discouraged bloodshed and war, should be found in such a situation. It was a pity that you so far forgot the tradition of your Church as to be engaged in an enterprise of such a nature. If you had not gone there, as you would have us believe to whisper consolation in the ears of the dying, you would not stand in the peril you now do. If you had stayed till a conflict had taken place, and then gone and declared what were your intentions, no one would have molested you. However unlimical to your church he might be, not a man in the Province would have said no to your mission in that respect. But you did not come in that way, but came to give encouragement and help to men who had faith in your power and authority, and they went boldly on in the knowledge that you were there to help them and give them the consolations of religion if they fell. How sad it is that you could encourage men who believed so much in your power, to plunder and murder our peaceable people. I have a painful duty to perform which I would like to avoid. But I am but the humble instrument of the law, You will have every opportunity if I have given any wrong direction to the Jury or made any mistake, to make application for redress. I will not, exercise the power which is given me by an Act passed since the commission of the offence of which you have been found guilty, to have the sentence of the law carried out immediately. There is no necessity for immediate punishment. You have had an impartial trial, and the Jury, I think, have come to a right conclusion according to the law, I do not wish to harrow up your feelings by any observations I could make. These could be of little use to you now, and therefore I will refrain. But I will say this—that if you had acted as the clergymen of your church have done in days gone, you would have tried to dissuade these men from the course they took. I have no further observations to make. The sentence of the Court upon you is, that you be taken to the place from whence you came, there to be detained till the 13th day of December next, and on that day to be taken from thence to the place of execution, and there to be hanged by the neck until you are dead, and may God have mercy on your soul.

The Court then adjourned, the throng of spectators poured out of the doors, and the solemn proceedings of the day were ended.

FENIAN DEMONSTRATION IN BUFFALO!

(*From the Express*, 29th.)

On *Sunday* evening last, (the better day the better deed), about 3000 rampant Fenians assembled in St. James' Hall, Buffalo, to consider the action of the Canadian Government in convicting Col. Lynch of treason, and to vent their feelings in their usual style. The *Express* says that the hall was most densely crowded in every part. When all was ready, the green flag was borne in, followed by the stars and stripes, whereupon there was a lot of first-class yelling. The chairman, Maurice Vaughn, in opening the ball, said he would have *preferred* holding the meeting on some toher evening to take into consideration the sentences said to have been passed upon American citizens by the Canadians, but he thought the exigencies of the case justified the call. A special committee was appointed to draft a strong resolution, when Mr. A. L. Morrison, a member of the "Irish Senate," being introduced, arose and delivered the following highly characteristic address:—

Men of Buffalo: We have met to deliberate upon a subject of grave importance to us as American citizens, whether born on foreign land or on the shores of America. [Applause.] I am free to acknowledge that the adopted citizens of this country are more immediately interested in the decision of this momentous question, because if we happen to cross the Niagara River; or happen to go to Germany or France, or any foreign country to which we might have once belonged, and it suits the him of the monarch who rules over that country to arrest us, and cast us into jail, why it seems that he can do it without question. [Applause.] It affects the natives of the country as well, because it strikes at the dignity of the American people. In 1812 the question came up for argument between England and America. You remember that when the grand old hero, Gen. Scott, was leading the soldiers of the Republic on this frontier, that some of our countrymen happened to be taken prisoners of war, and were immediately condemned to be shot, and one way Scott thought of to protect them was to tell them not to speak for tear the Irish tongue would tell the Englishmen to what country he belonged. But these men were carried to England, and she was compelled to give them back. [Applause.] And it is a proud reflection to us to know that the man who put the finishing touch to that conflict and scattered England's veteran troops of the Napoleonic wars like snow flakes, was Andrew Jackson—an Irishman. He next showed up the English navy, saying that her power on the ocean was passing away. On the doctrine of once a subject always a subject, he claimed that no Irishman was born beneath the British flag of his own free will, and they got away as quick as they could; and now we swear to support the flag of the United States, and the government guarantee to us the fullest privileges that her native born citizens enjoy; it guarantees to us security to our property. From the first day when that retreat took place from Lexington, until the day that Robert E. Lee surrendered, there has not been a battle field upon which Irishmen have not done there duty. [Applause].

In speaking of the green flag borne by Mulligan's brigade, he said that just before they surrendered, the flag was cut into shreds and wrapped around their bodies, to prevent it from falling into the hands of the enemy. As an instance of the worthlessness of the present naturalization process, he mentioned the case of a young man, formerly a major in the army of the United States, from Rochester, who was arrested in Ireland, and on applying to an American Consul, he was told that England claimed him as a subject, and nothing could be done for him. That is the protection our soldiers get when they go abroad. You may well ask it we have a law of naturalization. I demand, in the name of the Irish-adopted citizens, that measures be taken to protect us. [Tremendous cheering.] We are not beggars. We demand it as citizens of the Republic for which we are ready to live or die, as the case may be. [Hear, hear, hear]. In Canada, the other day, they arrested a poor priest who was administrating the rites of religion to the dying, and have sentenced him to be hanged. But every drop of blood they have shed in the past only serves to embitter us toward them; and this continued butchery prevents us from forgetting it. I want to compliment my countryman