could not assent to the passage of this resolution without being prepared at an early period to propose legislative action upon it. Under the circumstances he was not able to give his support to the motion.

The house then divided on the question whether the words proposed to be left out by Mr. Albert Grey should be omitted, and there voted for the omission 241, against 229. The speaker then put the question whether the words proposed to be inserted by Mr. Grey should form part of the motion, and the house divided—for Mr. Grey's amendment 251—against 152. The main motion as amended was then put and lost—for 349, against 46. These figures tell this tale. No half-hearted measure will meet the demands of the Welsh people. Nor will the House of Commons permit itself to be beguiled by such milk and water propositions as that of Mr. Albert Grey. The issue is plain—disestablishment or no disestablishment. We believe that the Church, not only in Wales, but in England, is doomed, and while we have no more regard for Protestant sectaries outside than we have for those inside the Anglican establishment, we do trust that the connection between Church and state in England will soon be a thing of the past. There appeared in the St. Louis *Globe-Democrat*, of March 21st, an interesting article from the pen of Adam Badeau, wherein he discusses Church and State in England with a truly piquant accuracy. The Church of England is, he says, the Church of the upper classes, doing whatever it does for the people as their superior. Part of the paternal system, it assists, he thinks, in governing the masses as a father does his family. Perhaps, suggests Badeau, one should rather say it is a relic of feudalism, and, like the army, still officered exclusively by the gentry. Its advocates boast that it maintains a gentleman in every parish, and no more potent engine exists, in his estimation, to uphold and supplement the aristocracy. The parson and the squire, like the nobleman and the prelate, are all on the one side. The Anglican church, itself a creature of the State, inculcates submission and deference to whatever else is established, instructing the people to order themselves lowly and reverently towards "their betters" and aspire to nothing higher than the state in which they find themselves. "The Church in England is," Badeau sets forth, "established by law. It is founded, not on the principle of divine authority, like the Church of Rome, but on the decrees and decisions of Parliaments and courts. Its head is not the Vicar of Christ, but the Queen. It is not, like our Protestant sects of every denomination in America, a voluntary association based on the consent of those who compose its communion; it is imposed on the people of England by the aristocracy, of which it is a component part. Originally "established" by Henry VIII., because he wanted to shift his wives, it remained a monument and instrument of royal authority until the Lords usurped the place of the King in the English system, and then it adapted itself to the change and became the bulwark and appurtenance of the aristocracy, which it still remains.

The writer in the *Globe Democrat* gives us a clear insight into the *modus operandi* of the disposal of benefices in this model establishment. He tells us that the power of appointing the clergy is a piece of property commonly attached to the land and the incumbent of a living is usually appointed by the squire or some neighboring nobleman, in whose family the privilege descends like any other inheritance. The greatest miscreant in life, or infidel in belief, may, if he owns the land, appoint the clergyman. If a child inherits, the guardian sometimes exercises the right; and, worse yet, the right may be sold. The succession to a wealthy piece of preferment is often disposed of years in advance. You may read in the *Times*, in this year of our Lord, advertisements of advowsons, as the right of patronage is called; the "cure of souls" for sale. Often the notice mentions that the incumbent is old, and the property is so much the more valuable, for the succession will be speedier. Then the advowson fetches a higher price.

The writer in the St. Louis journal thus proceeds to inform us that the squire usually appoints his second son to the benefice, the eldest inheriting the estate, the younger takes the parish, but if there be no second son, "some other member of the family gets an inning."

"Personal fitness has little or nothing to do with the appointment, and the choice of the souls who are to be "cured" counts for nothing at all. They have no more to say about who shall be their spiritual pastor and doctor than the sheep of any other flock in selecting their shepherd or the shepherd's dog."

Even a Jew who owns the property may present the priest to a Christian Church and the Church is obliged to receive him. I knew a wealthy Jewish Baronet who bought an old estate and was not contented till he had secured the advowson, which had been sold away from the property. He chuckled over his purchase and his privilege. A Catholic, he said, could not present to a living; the laws prohibit that outrage on the Protestant Church; but the preposterous supposition that a Jew could possess the prerogative had never been entertained."

Is it any marvel that a Church such as this has lost its hold on the public heart and public conscience? The marvel is that it has so long been allowed legal existence, and continued in the possession of privileges so grossly and so scandalously abused. Much of this is due, we believe, to the superiority of its clergymen in education, manners and even morals over the dissenting preachers.

THE TABLET ANSWERED BY LORD ASHBURNHAM.

If any one think that we in aught exaggerated in our statement of the 10th of April, that English Catholics were, as a body, the worst and most persistent enemies of Ireland, let him read the London *Tablet*, their organ, of the very same date:

The *Tablet* says: "Mr. Gladstone has brought in a bold bill, and a bill that spells secession. It was a strange sight, surely, of this old man pleading before the House, close ranked and pale with passion, that all the beliefs of his life were wrong, and calling upon the nation to divide its strength. Now, at the end of his days, when his race is nearly run, this hero of a hundred fights is left in his loneliness and faced by the men he has made. But the change has been with him and not with them. Mr. Gladstone had never a word on Thursday night to justify, defend or excuse the course he has taken in suddenly flinging in his lot with those who worked so long and so persistently to undo that union which a long line of English statesmen have held it the service of their lives to guard. Abandonment of the common Parliament for the three peoples is a needless and mischievous concession to that craving after national and visible separateness which makes half the peril of our difficulty with Ireland."

We regretfully alluded to the illogical and indefenceable position of English Catholics as a body toward Ireland, and still more regretfully cite the *Tablet* in support of our statement. We always allude with pain to racial differences, especially between Catholics, but the English are a frank people, and the relations between English and Irish Catholics ought not, and will not, we feel persuaded, suffer by plain, honest and fearless discussion. In putting the Irish side of the case we will use no words of our own. We are supplied with an abler, more succinct and telling exposition of the Irish Catholic case than any we could supply. It is from the pen of an *English Catholic peer*, Lord Ashburnham, who does honor to his order, his country and his race. In answer to the statement that the Irish people are so naturally and incurably disloyal that it would be dangerous to entrust them with the powers of self-government, he says:

"To this I am able to reply by so positive a denial of the premises, as to dispense me from the not very arduous task of disputing the inference. I deny that the Irish people are disloyal. I maintain, moreover, that they are pre-eminently loyal, and I affirm that all their most cruel sufferings have been brought upon them by their loyalty to just and holy causes which English disloyalty had betrayed and abandoned. They suffered under Cromwell for their loyalty to Charles I.; they suffered under William of Orange for their loyalty to James II.; and they suffered for centuries under successive lawful and unlawful English rulers for their loyalty to the Catholic faith. Catholics may differ among themselves as to the justice of the two former causes, and must differ from Protestants as to the sanctity of the last, but I challenge any Catholic or Protestant to deny that the fidelity with which the Irish people adhered to the three, through some of the most horrible persecutions which ever defiled the annals of humanity, ought forever to exonerate them from the charge of innate and incurable disloyalty. The noble lord then reminds the Catholics of England that if there be in the world one body of men which less than another has a right to traduce Irish loyalty, it is most assuredly the body of English Catholics. There are a few who can look back to a long line of ancestors faithful to their God and to their king, but most of us descend from forefathers who deserted their God to follow false prophets, and who drove their king into exile that they might be free to fawn at the feet of a foreign usurper; and what have we done ourselves to qualify us heroes or confessors? When we shall have shown the lamps of our own faith unextinguished after one gust of persecution, we may claim equality with those who have kept theirs burning through the storms and tempests of ages. When our allegiance shall have come out unblemished from the fiery furnace of revolution, it will be time for us to offer lessons in loyalty to the Irish people."

He then proceeds to say to his Catholic fellow-countrymen that meanwhile "it becomes us to be modest, remembering that the circumstances under which we have crept back unmolested into the bark of Peter are calculated to recall a familiar fact of natural history rather than any example recorded in the lives of the saints. Lord Denbigh has declared that the Irish people require to be taught to render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's. I believe that there are no people in the world more unfit than ourselves to give such instruction, and few who need it less than the Irish. I know at least that they have never betrayed God at the bidding of Cæsar, nor murdered Cæsar at the bidding of a mob.

Lord Denbigh has also called upon the Catholics of England to pray that saints may be raised up "to speak in and out of season to remind their countrymen of their duty to God and to their neighbor." He does not indicate any external mark of pre-sanctification by which these ready-made saints are to be recognized, but as their business will evidently be to stump the country in the Conservative interest, and to teach the Irish bishops and clergy their catechism, I venture to suggest that some such mark will be necessary to distinguish them from the ordinary electioneering agent and the average Protestant divine. Far be it from me to restrict the liberty of prayer within the limits of my own desires, or to question its efficacy beyond the bounds of my own reason.

By all means, says Lord Ashburnham, let those who agree with Lord Denbigh pray for the advent of this legion of Tory Saints, let them even go further and ask that angels may be sent down to serve as "harbingers" to the Primrose League. For my part I crave no such supernatural assistance. I am content to take the bishops and clergy of Ireland as they are; I am satisfied with the time-honored credentials which they bear; and I require of them no certificate of premature canonization. For aught I know, there may be some among them whom the Church may, in due course of time, be proud to recognize as having merited the palms of sanctity, but it is enough for me to thank heaven that the days are past when English Catholics might have been able to join with Irish Orangemen in conferring upon these holy men the crown of martyrdom. I have now concluded my task, and have only to add that, much as I rejoice to see the dawn of a brighter day gilding the prospects of Ireland, my joy is diminished by the knowledge that it is not shared by others, far worthier of it than I, who do not yet descry its cause. I cannot hope that my feeble words will prevail with them, but I firmly believe that their blindness is only temporary, and that their eyes will soon be opened to the manifest and marvellous mercy which, after all the barbarous cruelties and vile injustices inflicted by England upon Ireland, appoints us to be the active instruments of reparation instead of condemning us to be the passive victims of expiation, and permits us to work out for ourselves an honorable atonement, instead of sternly bidding us to stand aside, in abashed and powerless consternation, to let the justice of God pass by."

These are noble sentiments, becoming a Catholic nobleman and a Catholic legislator. With a few more Lord Ashburnhams the unfortunate ill-feeling between English and Irish Catholics would be soon removed and the good will of Christian brotherhood substituted.

THE LOYALIST FLUNKEYS DISTURBED.

The city of Ottawa, while containing many good people in its limits, is afflicted with a larger number of cranks, flunkeys, lackeys, and lick-spittles than any place of its size on the continent. The seat of government, with all its treasons, strategy and spoil, has brought them to that one spot—and there they are as thick as bees in a swarm. We do believe that, were the Marquis of Lansdowne to invite the "Loyalists" of Ottawa to prostrate themselves on some given day before the simulacrum of royalty at Ottawa, the Riot Act would have to be read, and the Governor General's Foot Guards, as we believe they term the armed chivalry of our metropolitan city, called out to preserve the peace. The weaker flunkeys had certainly better have a care that they were not trampled under foot by their more muscular brethren in the rush to do homage to shadowed royalty. Any one who knows Ottawa is well aware that the flunkeys are ever ready for a sensation. It fills them with delight to find a fellow citizen "disloyal" after their way of viewing loyalty and disloyalty. It does appear (*horrible dictu*), that at the last St. Patrick's day concert in that city "God Save the Queen" was not among the musical selections on the evening's programme. And it does further appear that the bandmaster on the occasion took it upon himself to break his agreement with the parties that employed him, and favor (!) the auditory with this manifestation of loyalty in music, wherefor he was promptly called to task by Mr. MacCabe, president of the St. Patrick's Literary Association, by which body, he, (the bandmaster,) was employed to do and agreed to do their will. Metropolitan Loyalty was offended at Mr. MacCabe's just, manly and fair-minded course. Its indignation had to find vent in an anonymous letter—favorite refuge of Ottawa's sycophants, rib-stabbers and lick-spittles—and in the Ottawa *Citizen*, organ of the red-hot no-Popery loyalists:

SIR,—There is a report in circulation that at the conclusion of a concert recently given by the St. Patrick's Society, the band of the Governor General's Foot Guards, which was in attendance, having played God Save the Queen, the bandmaster, Mr. Bonner, was reprimanded for so doing by Mr. MacCabe, the headmaster of the Normal School. If the above mentioned report is untrue it is only fair that Mr. MacCabe should have the opportunity of clearing himself; if, on the other hand, it is correct, Mr. MacCabe is out-Heroding Herod, in reprimanding the bandmaster of one of Her Majesty's regiments for performing the national air, and the attention of the Ontario Government should be drawn to the case. It is hardly desirable that the education of the youth of this country should be entrusted to a man who thus airs his disloyalty.

Mr. Bonner's duty at this point was to our mind very clear. He should have come out like a man and stated the real facts of the case, and thus exonerated Mr. MacCabe from the odium of charges at once false and groundless. As he did not, however, do so, but joined in the effort to place Mr. MacCabe in a false position, we are glad to see that Mr. MacCabe undertook in good time, not his defence, for against the charges made no defence was necessary, but the plain statement of the facts of the case. Mr. MacCabe puts the matter very clearly:

Mr. Bonner in one of the statements made in his letter gives away the whole matter. "He (Mr. MacCabe) informed me that I should not have played 'God Save the Queen;' that I should have played a selection as indicated by the programme." Precisely. This is my contention all along, that the selection should not have been omitted. I come now to the latter part of Mr. Bonner's letter. There he is in fault. I am glad that Mr. Bonner put in the saving clause "to the best of my recollection." For I can assure him and the public that his recollection is very much astray as to my reference to what took place at previous concerts. The fact is, when I called Mr. Bonner aside, he was in very bad temper, how caused I know not, and I do not wonder that he has forgotten the exact words I used. In referring to the manner of closing previous concerts, I could not say "It was not played last year," because I was not present at the close of last year's concert; and I can not even now say how that concert closed. What I did say is exactly the following: "I am sure it was not played last year for the purpose of excluding the selection of Irish airs announced on the programme." I now say, once for all, and in the most emphatic manner, I did not find fault with Mr. Bonner for playing "God Save the Queen," as such, but simply for leaving out what he had undertaken to play, and the music for which was actually open before the orchestra. I come now to the fourth point in the correspondence; and that is the action of the military authorities in this matter. Suppose, for the sake of argument, I did reprimand Mr. Bonner for playing "God Save the Queen," in what way would I be responsible to Major Macpherson or the president of the Band Committee? What did they propose to do with me in that event? I have been called before the bar of public opinion. Is not this enough? I think I have given a satisfactory explanation, one that will be accepted by all fair-minded men. A petition for my removal from the position I have the honour to occupy has been, or perhaps is, in circulation in the city looking for signatures. Is not this enough? I am to be cited before the Minister of Education. Is not this enough? If not, is there not a civil tribunal before which to cite me? Did they intend to try me by court-martial? Are we under martial law in this city? In the public press I have now fully met all the charges made against me; and I am prepared to meet them before any tribunal to which I am properly accountable; but I am not going to submit to any Star Chamber investigation or drum-head court of enquiry.

The fact of the matter is, that while Mr. MacCabe did his duty by the society of which he was the presiding officer, Mr. Bonner broke his agreement. The principal of the Ottawa Normal School is too good a citizen to need defence from the "loyalist" bigots who have conspired to injure him and menaced him with loss of the position he so well fills. Mr. MacCabe comes out of the discussion greatly strengthened. We are glad to learn that the St. Patrick's Literary Association has sustained the course of their late president. At all Irish gatherings deserving the name, the grand national hymn, "God save Ireland," is sung at the close, and no fitter termination of an Irish entertainment could be found. This and no other is Ireland's national anthem.

BALLYKILBEG'S CANADIAN CONTINGENT.

The Orange member for South Belfast in the Imperial Commons, recently interviewed by the *Pall Mall Gazette* on the question of Home Rule for Ireland, vomited forth fire, brimstone, and terror. His heart is full of civil war, he wants another battle of the Boyne, and sighs for a chance to kick Queen Victoria's crown into the waters of that historic stream.

"I meet continually," said he, "with men who say, 'If we believe in the danger of civil war we would oppose Mr. Gladstone; but we don't.' I tell them they are mistaken; I said twelve years ago, on Mr. Butt's motion, in March, 1874, that any attempt to promote a separate parliament would produce civil war. The other day when I was at Ballykilbeg, a hundred men assembled to confer as to the best kind of arms they should secure, and I was to consult with some military gentlemen in England on the best means of defence. We have not collected arms as yet, except in a few instances, because we don't believe that the people of England, when they are thoroughly aroused to a complete understanding of the matter, will permit their fellow-loyalists in Ireland to be dealt with in the way proposed.''

But the following is the choicest portion of the interview, and will be read everywhere in Canada with heartiest amusement.

"We received the other day *a resolution in which two hundred thousand Orangemen in Canada pledged themselves to come to our aid*: but as to prospects of help from England, Scotland or elsewhere, I cannot at present give [illegible] information. The fact is, th[illegible]le idea has not yet been seri[illegible]tained by great bodies of peop[illegible]ked upon as so perfectly chimerical that no one has thought of taking active steps to resist it."

Canadian Orangemen are strong on "resolutions," but scarce and weak on the field of action. Their fortes are church burnings, cold-blooded murders, midnight assaults, cowardly threats, and diabolical tyranny towards isolated Catholics. If they seriously want fighting on the question of Home Rule, they can be fully satisfied in Canada. But this is not the sort of satisfaction they want. If they could have a few thousand unarmed Papists to massacre, then and only then would they feel satisfied. As Ballykilbeg, however, may be in want of officers, we might spare him Tyrwhitt, of South Simcoe, John White of "Blind Share" notoriety, the editor of the Huntingdon *Gleaner*, and the sub-editor of the Ottawa *Citizen*.

REV. DR. BURNS ON HOME RULE.

The Rev. Dr. Burns, President of the Wesleyan Female College, Hamilton, delivered on Monday evening, the 26th inst., in the Grand Opera House of that city, under the auspices of the Irish National League, a lecture on Home Rule, of which we deeply regret our inability to give a full report. Dr. Burns, very unlike Dr. Potts and Prof. Goldwin Smith, takes a broad and humane view of the case. As an Irishman, he has faith in Irishmen, believing them fully capable of self-government. As a friend to British imperial influence and greatness and a loyal subject of his sovereign, Dr. Burns feels it his duty to further the cause of good government by pronouncing in favor of Irish Home Rule. Of the Gladstone measures of reform he said:

It is also as freely admitted that, whether this Bill carries or not, the cause is gained.

For right is right since God is God,
And right the day must win;
To doubt would be disloyalty,
To falter would be sin.

Two great thoughts are embraced, Home Rule and the land purchase. Against the first there can be no valid objection. On all sides we are told, "I have no objection to a measure of Home Rule for Ireland, but," and the "but" is usually the big end of the sentence that we are asked to carry Nothing has shown more fully the depth to which some can descend than the effort to poison the public mind against Home Rule by affirming that it means separation. Parnell has been quoted, and as promptly denied the imputation; cablegrams have been published from the leaders of the Land League in America, to be as promptly repudiated. I blush for the political status of an age or party that can stoop so low to block a measure of justice to the oppressed. But the most humiliating spectacle that I have been called to witness is that of an Irishman opposing the freedom of his country. Yet I have met such characters. Only last week I met one so verdant as to actually ask if Ireland really was oppressed. He reminded me of the poor fellow suffering from nausea, who was leaning his head on the fence and retching violently to relieve himself. He was approached by a sympathizer with the question, "Are you sick?" Straightening himself up, he looked the interrogator in the face and replied, "Did you think I was doing this for fun?" I commend the Socratic answer to my emerald friend. Another question that is innocently put is this: "Are the land laws of Ireland any worse than those of England?" I shall answer that question in the words of the Prime Minister of England: "It is only the skeletons of the laws of the two countries that bear any resemblance to each other. The flesh and the blood with which the figures are invested are wholly different. All the circumstances, all the associations and all the accretions that have grown around the native ideas are different in the one country from what they are in the other. We cannot name a point in which the relation of landlord and tenant in Ireland and in Great Britain are the same, except only in what may be called the abstract and the general idea."

The Irish National League of Hamilton deserves the hearty commendation and earnest gratitude of Irishmen throughout the Dominion for eliciting so general and so convincing an expression of opinion from a gentleman of the influence and position of Dr. Burns.

CANADIAN SYMPATHY WITH IRELAND.

L'Etendard of the 24th says that the five Irish members of the Quebec Legislative Assembly, Messrs. Carbray, Lynch, Flynn, Shehyn, and McShane nailed their national flag so firmly to the mast, affirmed so emphatically their feelings and opinions, that the Assembly, overcome by their force of character, unanimously voted in the sense they demanded. The Quebec *Chronicle*, a somnolent organ of the fossilized loyalty of the Georgian period, feigned indignation at the fact that a body so insignificant as the Legislature of Quebec should in a matter of imperial concern dare approach the British Prime Minister. The *Chronicle* and the false prophets who predicted that the Quebec legislature would only get snubbed for its pains, if it went out of its sphere to adopt the resolution congratulating Mr. Gladstone on his measure of Home Rule for Ireland, were intensely disappointed when Speaker Wurtele, on the 20th ult., reported that he had cabled the resolution and received the following reply:—

London, April 20.—To the Speaker of the Quebec Legislative Assembly:

I have received with deep gratification your telegram informing me of the resolution unanimously adopted by the Legislative assembly of Quebec in support of the measure now before parliament for the future government of Ireland, and I am also writing to you my acknowledgements. (Signed) W. E. GLADSTONE.

When Mr. Gladstone's message had been read, it was, on the motion of the Hon. Mr. Lynch, seconded by Mr. Carbray, ordered that it be placed in the Votes and proceedings of the House.

If the First Minister of England so highly appreciates the action of the Quebec Legislature, ought not the friends of Home Rule in the Canadian Commons be, as we last week suggested, astir to procure from that body an endorsation of Mr. Gladstone's policy. Canadians of every origin are interested in the settlement of the Irish question, and the Parliament of Canada has already in this sense expressed itself. We call upon the member for Centre Montreal, as representative of the largest and most powerful community of Irishmen in the Dominion, to step into the breach on this occasion and prove himself worthy of the occasion and the cause. We expect him to put higher value on Home Rule for Ireland than on the loss or gain of a few seats for partisan purposes in the Canadian Parliament. Let him take a leaf out of the book of the Minister of Inland Revenue, who, when a private member, forced by patriotic determination the government and legislature of Canada to a vote endorsing Home Rule. There must not, on this occasion at all events, be any bending before Orange threats. Canada as a self-governed country expects every man to do his duty. The Irish Catholics of Canada will tolerate no hesitation, nor accept any excuse at the hands of their representatives in this primary and momentous crisis in Ireland's history for failure to do their duty to Canada and to the empire.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

HIS Lordship the Bishop of Ottawa conducted, during the closing days of Lent, a most successful retreat for the English-speaking men of the Cathedral congregation.

OUR dear friend of the Ottawa *Citizen* is troubled at our handling of Dr. McVicar. Afraid to come out boldly with what he thinks inwardly, and endorsing McVicar's clerical mendacity and villainy, the *Citizen's* "Sandy Row" man satisfies his hatred of Rome and the priesthood by a fling at the editor of the RECORD. The latter feels honored by the attention.

A MEETING under the presidency of His Worship the Mayor of Ottawa was held in that city on Friday evening last to take into consideration some means to alleviate the distress in the West of Ireland. There was, we learn, a small attendance, but some good work was done, as the subscription list then opened will show: Mr. Baskerville heading it with $50; Hanrahan Bros. came next with $50; Mayor McDougal, $30; Capt. McCaffrey, $25; Mr. Bennett, $10.

OUR esteemed city contemporary, the *Free Press*, published before Christmas an excellent article on the subject of Home Rule. We have not, however, heard from our contemporary on this vital question since this, notwithstanding that Mr. Gladstone has before the Imperial Commons a measure proposing to give Ireland that which the *Free Press* so ably demanded, a liberal measure of Irish self-government. As the question of voting an endorsation of the Gladstonian policy will soon engage the attention of the Canadian Parliament, we should rejoice to have our contemporary's views on the matter.

WHAT WE said concerning the attitude of English Catholics towards Home Rule appears to have been misunderstood. We have been in fact accused of assailing English Catholics because they are English. Now nothing could be further from the truth. The English Catholics are but a handful of England's total, and an insignificant fragment of England's Catholic population. We may justly claim that we know not how to make an indictment against a nation. The English race has too many claims to the respect of mankind to allow of any one to assail it. But by what we did say of the English Catholics, as a body, we firmly stand. We have nothing to withdraw, nothing to excuse, nothing to explain away. Our remarks did not have reference to such noble English Catholics as Cardinals Manning and Newman, Bishop Bagshaw, Lords Ashburnham and Ripon, trusted friends of Ireland, but they had certainly reference to those for whom the *Tablet* and the Duke of Norfolk, and these are the majority of English Catholics, can claim to speak.

THE Toronto *Tribune* literally demolishes and obliterates Mr. Curran on the legality question that this gentleman attempted to argue with us. The *Tribune* says of one of Mr. Curran's letters to us: "This is not even sophistry. It is unmitigated undisguised nonsense. That is legal which is done according to law, and evidence was procured by the most infamous means, but according to law and juries were packed, but according to law and judges were selected, but according to law and trials were conducted so as to secure conviction; but in most if not in all those cases in which honest men were sent to the scaffold, because they loved their country not wisely but too well, or because it was thought necessary for the maintenance of the ascendancy or of landlord's privileges to hang a few troublesome men as an example, the trials were conducted strictly according to law. Even in our day we have seen in Dublin as at Regina men called as jurors ordered to stand aside because they were Catholics. That was not the reason given, it is true, but that it was the reason no one can doubt. That was done by authority of law—was legal, but was it fair?" Mr. Curran will of course tell the editor of the *Tribune*, who compares we think very favorably with even that distinguished luminary, the member for Montreal centre, that he is beside the controversy, and then wear the self complacent smile of victory easily won.