

onous chorus, uttering all sorts of lies about his character. On the score of obscenity to Sir Louis and the others my answer is. "Tis you that say it, not I; you do the deeds, and your unworthy deeds find me the words." And their deeds found me words for which I actually apologised in the original communication in the following sentences: "Is it any special wonder that the press of Dawson has suffered in character when called upon by the people to formulate their indignation against a banded anarchy? It is impossible to attack this administration and retain an academic tone." And again: "It is difficult to launch with success a dignified general attack on an anarchy that stands behind the governmental guns and bayonets and laughs at a few down-trodden miners with their brothers put to sleep beneath the snow because they cannot compel it to put its agents in jail for embezzlement and malfeasance."

Now to the question of my "destroying the credit and slandering the name and fair fame of the Grand Old Dominion of Canada." That kind of language is cheap in Ottawa. But it is hard to believe that a mere lunatic could accomplish such a mighty destruction.

Those honourable gentlemen have made a mistake. They imagine that "they" are the Grand Old Dominion of Canada. They have yet to learn that the Dominion of Canada will survive their work of suicide to which I have not even had the honor of instigating them. The document said many good things about the Dominion of Canada and its people. It attacked a government that has criminally betrayed the trust of the people. It said: "There is something strange in the governmental atmosphere of Canada, when the Minister of the Interior, after betraying the trust of the people, has the audacity to stand up in parliament and ridicule criticism of his administration. And again it said: "It is a sad spectacle to see a brave and loyal people maintaining the balance of their country's credit in a foreign land with their lives, while a number of lawyers and scheming politicians are destroying that balance of credit at home by their governmental trickery."

Sir Louis and the rest are loud in their condemnation of one who is a total stranger to them. That is because they are under the restraint of a "parliamentary privilege." It is when chained and kennelled that dogs yell loudest and are least to be regarded. Loose their chains and set them free and it will be seen how harmless they are in reality, how tame, how ready to crawl and fawn to have us flatteringly pat their empty canine heads.

The display of parliamentary eloquence in Ottawa on the 28th of June was remarkable. When honorable gentlemen boom forth such reverberating words as, "This House;" "This Parliament;" "The records of this House;" "Most scurrilous document that ever was penned," or a dramatic, "Sir, I protest;" no matter how harmless, except in the breakage of governmental machinery, and how empty headed they may know themselves to be at bottom, they must feel that to their equally harmless colleagues they present a figure of portentous significance.

WILLIAM CATTO.

I  
agita  
is no  
sister

To 7

hope  
impe  
and  
dimi  
and

can l  
its o  
The  
ishit  
may  
acco  
cessi  
Otta  
cessi  
ernr  
"dei  
to sl  
cert  
But  
argt  
whi  
kno  
read  
issu

cout  
quet  
easy  
con  
eraf  
tain  
cess  
Yuk  
Ott  
the  
and  
affa  
a us  
our  
day  
gol  
pro  
the  
alw  
the  
ridi  
not  
mas