

not true that the Irish Catholic vote has of late been with the Conservatives. On the contrary, it is notorious that many elections in Ontario were carried for the Reformers by the Catholic vote. I am not aware how many Irish Catholics are in the House of Commons at present, but most assuredly Mr. Speaker Anglin and Mr. Devlin, M.P. for Montreal Centre, are representative Irish Catholics, and both are decided liberals. Mr. Devlin contested Montreal Centre with an Irish Roman Catholic who ran in the Conservative interest, and he succeeded in obtaining a majority in a constituency in which, beyond all others, Irish Catholic influence prevails. And I may here observe that with reference to the remark "that the political sentiments of the Irish are identical with those of the Irish in the mother country," that it evinces a very superficial knowledge of the state of Irish feeling. I have shewn how widely the Irish Catholics of Montreal differ as to Canadian politics; but it is nevertheless a fact that those same parties can unite in expressing opinions favourable to Home rule. The truth is that they are so attached to Home rule in Canada, that they would like, if possible, to see it extended to Ireland. Their sympathy with their fellow-countrymen in Ireland is manifested by pecuniary contributions; but with regard to Canadian politics they vote, not as a religious body, but according to the bias of their feelings and the various influences brought to bear on them. A sagacious statesman will at once perceive, what has completely escaped the observation of the essayist, that there is no inconsistency whatever in the Irish Catholics in Canada being dissatisfied with the existing relations between Great Britain and Ireland, and yet being perfectly satisfied with those between the United Kingdom and Canada. The French Canadian Roman Catholics are likewise very far from unanimous in their political sentiments. There are two distinct parties, Conservative and Liberal, and although the former is in the majority in the Province of Quebec, there is a minority, respectable both in numbers and talent; while in the Dominion Liberal government there are three cabinet ministers all Roman Catholics.

I shall now proceed to the third division of my criticism, viz., "erroneous reasoning." I entirely dissent from the position laid down at the opening of the essay, that it is wise or profitable for a statesman to regulate his policy by any "forecast of the future." Let me not be misunderstood. A wise statesman ought to endeavour to make the political institutions of his country as perfect as possible. If our statesmen in 1830 believed, as there is no doubt they did, that there was danger of revolution unless the representative system were reformed, it was their duty to apply a remedy. The same remark would apply to those statesmen who proposed and carried Catholic emancipation. But that is just what the essayist objects to, when he remarks that "party politicians cannot afford to see beyond the hour." He requires a "forecast of the future," which is precisely what neither he nor any other man is capable of making. It is said by the essayist that "to tax forecast with revolutionary designs or tendencies is absurd." To this I demur. Nothing is easier than for one who desires revolution, "to cast a political horoscope," to make a "forecast," and then, on the pretence of providing for what is certain to occur, to strain every effort to bring about the desired result. I am opposed to revolution, and if I could forecast anything in the future likely to bring it about, I would spare no effort to prevent it. The truth is that with the essayist "the wish is father to the thought." He evidently prefers the Republican system of government to the Monarchical, at which he sneers incessantly throughout his essay. He seems, however, to give it a preference as being less democratic. He pronounces Canada "a democracy of the most pronounced kind;" considers the Governor-General "not wrong in saying that she is more democratic than the United States, where the President is an Elective King, and where the Senate, which though elective is Conservative, possesses great power, whereas the nominated Senate of Canada is a cypher." I may remark *en passant* that this same cypher threw out a ministerial bill of considerable importance passed by the Commons, having reference to British Columbia, and that the Prime Minister made a distinct proposition to have that body increased in order to bring it more into harmony with the Commons. To return from this digression: "Demagogism