

If we can fancy such a series of discreditable transactions as these to have occurred in England, we know that the officer thus distinguishing himself, would not only be dismissed from the public service, but from all respectable associations with loyal and honorable men.

Let me assume that Mr. Bulwer, when dismissed by the Government of Spain for obeying the Queen's instructions, returned to London through Southampton. That, at a meeting got up by the municipal authorities of that city, a band of Spanish sympathizers appeared, headed by a Revenue officer. That then and there Mr. Bulwer was slandered, the policy of England denounced, and the Court of Madrid justified. If we can imagine such a scene to have occurred, we know well what would have happened immediately after.

Let me suppose that a riot had occurred within twenty miles of London. That this demonstration was so formidable that troops had to be called out. That ten or twelve of the rioters had been arrested, and were on trial. Fancy an officer of the Inland Revenue taking into his head that these people were all innocent, getting up subscriptions to defeat the Government prosecutions, taking his seat day after day in Court, in their midst, and, in the presence of Her Majesty's Attorney General, openly countenancing those rioters. Fancy the Attorney General declaring in open Court, that, if those prosecutions failed, the jurisprudence of the country was disgraced. Fancy the Revenue officer, when they had failed, the Jurors not agreeing, glorifying himself on the result in the public newspapers, in open defiance of the Government of which he was the servant. Can we fancy such transactions to have occurred in England? But if they had, the officer of the Inland Revenue would have discovered that if the Jurors were divided, the Cabinet was not. His place would not be worth an hour's purchase, under any administration, Whig or Tory.

Having now shown that Mr. Condon's conduct is utterly indefensible, tried by English rules of Administration, let me try them by our own.

On the 30th April, 1855, the leader of the Government made this declaration, not of policy but of principle, which was subsequently sanctioned by the supporters of the present Administration, Catholic and Protestant.

We are arraigned for displacing a few of the Tory Commissioners of Annapolis, but we have a memorial from the Custos and a large number of the Magistrates and leading men of the County, approving of the work, and a Government is not worthy of the name that has not the vigor to protect its friends when they are wronged and insulted.

The Government were charged, too, with the dismissal of the Postmaster at Windsor, but I do not hesitate to avow that the principle we then acted on we are determined to adhere to as the British rule, and that the subordinates of Government who oppose it must be content to resign or to lose their places.

Acting upon these principles, Mr. Geldert was dismissed from the Post Office in Windsor, for voting against a member of the Cabinet at an election. Mr. Miller was dismissed from the Board of Works, for some alleged subordination; and Mr. Mc Naughton, of Shelburne, has been, it is said, more recently removed for voting, not against an officer but a supporter of the Government.

All these gentlemen are Protestants. Not one of them has placed himself in an attitude so defiant, and insulting as Mr. Condon. Not one of them has brought on his country the dishonour and discredit that he has inflicted. It remains to be seen whether Catholics and Protestants are to be restrained by the same rules of Administration—subjected to the same discipline, or whether we are to adopt new ones, and whether the Protestant gentlemen, already dismissed are to be restored.