

Every man should stand mainly upon his own merits, that is, advocate his claims for office or place chiefly on the score of ability to discharge its duties honestly and faithfully. But if the government of a country or a province in the distribution of public appointments, systematically ignore a class of people on account of their religion; or if for the same reason the electors of a constituency defeat a good and competent man, then there are just grounds of complaint. In such cases, the government lays itself open to the charge of unfairness, and the constituency to that of bigotry, while the position of both will suffer at least moral injury in comparison with that of the ignored class or rejected individual. But; in the absence of good evidence to this effect, it is very bad taste, not to say bad policy, to raise a hue-and-cry on the score of religion, and endeavor to shew with violent language that the great cause of a candidate's non-success, was antagonism to his system of belief. Such a course generally serves to make matters worse. A man's own dignity suffers by it, and the cause which he claims to advocate becomes prejudiced. Because the respectable portion of the community looks coldly on him who makes religion his plea for position; and bigotry, which under ordinary circumstances, might be induced to view the aspirant's faith with complacency, becomes inflamed by his intemperate course, and makes his future prospects more difficult to be realized.

THE GENERAL ELECTIONS form the great topic of the day, creating intense excitement and straining the public mind to an alarming extent. Experience teaches that such an event as this is a civil war on a small scale. Neighbors, friends and relatives array themselves in opposing camps and by that feeling which contrary discussions constantly persisted in always generates, they become uncordial towards

one another if not actually estranged. Add to this the discomforts and annoyances caused by meetings and canvassers, as well as the absence of anything readable in the newspapers, and one almost wishes that elections occurred but once in a lifetime. Nevertheless, we Canadians, in view of the possession of representative government with responsible ministers can willingly bear with the evil. There is no rose without its thorn.

THE ruffians who murdered Lord Cavendish and his secretary, grievously wounded the Irish nation at the same time; and Ireland in mourning the cruel fate of the slaughtered gentlemen, laments the injury done to herself. It is a matter of consolation (even if only simple justice) to know that the intelligent world exonerates the Irish people from all blame in the crime. It would be superfluous for Irishmen themselves to disclaim the deed; the fervent, sincere, and universal cry of horror and indignation that went up from the Irish people both at home and abroad, is sufficient to prove the innocence of the nation. If anything else were wanting to complete the proof, it could be supplied by considering the cowardly, cruel, and treacherous manner in which the deed was done—altogether foreign to the manly spirit of the average Irishman.

NATIONAL irresponsibility for the Dublin assassination being fully established, there was certainly insufficient warrant for the re-introduction of coercive measures binding the whole country. The American government did not proclaim martial law when its president was shot, neither did the British government pass a coercion bill for England when the queen was fired at, then why should the Irish people be subjected to the hardships of ultra juridical measures on account of the deed of one or two wretches acting on their own