

the former Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada Roman Catholics were Liberals; and after the Union they continued to be Liberals under Mr. Baldwin and Sir Francis Hincks, and until the coalition of 1854 introduced confusion into the political affairs of the Province. It is surely not unnatural—the reasons which separated them for a time from the Liberal party being at an end since Confederation—that they should be found gradually returning to the party to which they have generally belonged in Ireland, and to which they belonged for so many years here.

If we are to have an increased number of Roman Catholic supporters at the approaching elections, it is quite certain that we are not to have the support of all. The Hon. Frank Smith is still in the Cabinet of Sir John Macdonald as a representative of the Roman Catholics of Ontario; and other prominent Roman Catholics of this city are still avowed and active Conservatives. The *Irish Canadian* and its proprietors are Conservative. That journal in a recent number announced frankly that if by means of a No Popery cry the Reformers should be displaced the *Irish Canadian* will not complain. Its hostility to the Liberal party is so great that its managers are glad to have us beaten even by a No Popery cry.

In view of the considerations which I have set forth, and of the personal statements which I have made, a little reflection will convince my friends that the fact of an increased number of Roman Catholic voters purposing to support our candidates at the next election does not afford any good reason for alarm on account of Protestant interests, or for apprehension about our civil and religious liberties.

THE REV. MR. McLEOD'S LETTER.

Of the three letters, Mr. McLeod's is the hardest for a Presbyterian layman to bear who has been endeavouring to do his duty, and whose endeavours have hitherto met with acceptance from his fellow-Presbyterians as well as others; for Mr. McLeod repeats, and evidently believes, several of the untrue things which the *Review* articles contained, and which are not mentioned by Mr. Macdonnell or yourself, though Mr. McLeod mentions them (as I have already acknowledged) without the virulence which the *Review* articles display. I presume that in sanctioning the insertion of those articles in the *Review*, if he had anything to do with their insertion, he did so from that general concurrence in some of their statements which appears from his letter, and without perceiving the political bias and personal animus running through the articles.