

or any other ranting writer against the Infallibility of the Pope.

The 'Guardian,' in common with the herd of calumniators, assails the loyalty of Catholics. It would be no more than what common decency demanded, were the 'Guardian' first to defend the loyalty of the opponents of Papal Infallibility. Who have been, and are, the most loyal men in Europe—Catholics or their assailants? This is the question. For the last three centuries, for example, who have been the rebels, the fomenters of disturbance, the revolutionists—Catholics or their calumniators and opponents? Let the revolution and rebellion of 1688 answer, let the rebellion of 1798 in Ireland answer. Who were the leaders and chief agents in these movements—Catholics or non-Catholics? Was that unnatural nephew and son-in-law—William the Third, who led a horde of foreign mercenaries into England to dethrone its legitimate sovereign, a Catholic? were the traitors who aided and abetted him, who betrayed their king and sold the honor of their country, Catholics? Were CROMWELL and the other regicides, his companions, Catholics? Were Lord EDWARD FITZGERALD, WOLFE TONE, EMMETT, &c., Catholics? Were the French Revolutionists for the last ninety years Catholics? Is GARIBALDI and his following, Catholic? Were the men who made revolutions in Spain and Portugal, Catholic? But, on the contrary, who have been for ever found on the side of loyalty and order, who have ever been the most strenuous upholders of the sacred rights of life and property, the most able and disinterested advocates of established and legitimate governments? Let history answer. Catholics everywhere and always. In fact, there are not a few who think that Catholics have carried their devotion to loyalty to excess. And yet in the face of these and such like notorious facts, here we find a very common-place writer, in a very common-place newspaper, audaciously impugning the loyalty of Catholics. With us, loyalty is a religious duty and dearly have we paid for our faithful discharge of it.

The 'Guardian' repeats a passage from a speech of Prince BISMARCK, in which he says that the Vatican Council "was cut short on account of the war, and that very different votes would have been taken by the Council, if the French had been victorious. Some months ago, the 'Guardian' made use of this passage, quoting these very words, in an onslaught on Catholics. We took notice of the matter at the time, and pointed out that the Decree on Papal Infallibility had been agreed to in the Council before this war had been even proclaimed, and that consequently, the success or non-success of the French could not possibly have had the slightest influence in determining the votes of the Fathers in the Vatican Council. We also said, from our own personal knowledge, that there is not one word of truth in another calumny, stated by the 'Guardian,' viz., that the "war was the combined work of Rome and France." But what does the 'Guardian' care? Its writers wish to insult and injure Catholics, and consequently calumnies are repeated again and again, notwithstanding the most direct and clearest refutation. And we entertain no doubt whatever but that the 'Guardian,' in two or three months hence, will again repeat this falsehood.

The 'Guardian' states as a fact the following: "From the POPE himself, Mr GLADSTONE's pamphlet has elicited fierce denunciations, and the appellation of 'viper' has been applied by HIS HOLINESS, in the spirit of Christian meekness, to its author." The London 'Tablet,' always well informed as to what takes place in the Vatican, says that HIS HOLINESS did not make use of this word, or of the language put into his mouth by the Press. It is therefore, like the other statements of the 'Guardian,' a pure invention. But as we said above, we have no doubt the 'Guardian' will repeat this falsehood by and by.

The 'Guardian' says: "Who can doubt that he—the POPE—has interfered in the affairs of Spain during the bloody Carlist war, which we are now told by telegraph that he advises DON CARLOS to put an end to." Again, the 'Guardian' says: "Who can doubt that he has used his utmost power to prevent the progress of the German Empire towards consolidation?" Well, we doubt both one and the other. There is not a particle of evidence to show that the POPE interfered either in Spain or Germany; and until the evidence of his interference is placed before us, we shall continue to doubt. But observe the injustice of our contemporary: He asks who can doubt, and then proceeds to lecture and censure, as if he had proved that the POPE had interfered!

The 'Guardian' grows quite unctuous and pathetic towards the end of this precious leader. Addressing Catholics

our contemporary says: "Gentlemen, however sincere you may be, however much you may deprecate any intended interference with our personal liberty, the necessary tendency of your doctrine of Infallibility is to centre all political as well as spiritual power in the hands of one man and his emissaries. It is slavery in disguise; and if once we submit, we shall only be riveting on ourselves fetters of which our forefathers freed us at the cost of their blood." What are the fetters of which our contemporary speaks? If he had said that the tendency of centralising all power in the State, and of permitting private judgment to guide supremely is to rivet the chains of slavery on Catholics, and that the fetters imposed upon them by the enemies of the POPE have been stained by the best blood of tens of thousands of peaceful and loyal Catholics, who only asked for freedom of conscience, our contemporary would have told the truth and written common sense; but his words are strangely out of place, and grimly ludicrous in the connection in which he places them.

OFFICIAL CIRCUMLOCUTION.

SOME few months since the strictures of the Press were instrumental in sweeping away some absurd regulations with regard to the postage on newspapers, and it was then hoped that many similar absurdities which were known to exist, but not specified, would also be abolished. It would appear, however, that the various governmental departments are far from exempt from the circumlocutory red-tape routine of the mother country, so severely lampooned by DICKENS, and that they adhere with the tenacity of barnacles to traditions and usages, the strength of which would appear to increase with the absurdity. It may be remembered that until lately for some reason unknown—at least beyond the pale of the department,—the public were not only prohibited from making use of newspaper stamps in the postage of letters, but the halfpenny stamps, for the transit of intercolonial papers, were utterly useless when despatched outside of the colony, notwithstanding the required postage was paid to the revenue. Why this should have been the case, or what end was to be accomplished by its practice, was a mystery which we were never able to unravel. Had the prohibition stopped at the disallowance of newspaper stamps on letters, we might have accounted for it by supposing that the department wished to keep the receipts from the two sources separate; but, of course, the distinction with regard to newspapers upset the supposition. Whether the extreme absurdity of the proceeding, and its injustice and inconvenience, became apparent to the authorities, or the voice of public opinion, through its mouthpiece, the Press, had sufficient weight to cause the attention, we are unable to divine, but the obnoxious prohibition was withdrawn. During the past week, however, a case has been brought under our notice which, as an example of red-tape routine of the most orthodox and approved stamp, would be amusing, were it not for the injustice committed. It would appear that the rule of the department, with regard to the delivery of newspapers, prescribes that if the party to whom the paper be addressed has left the address, the subsequent papers received at the office are never put into the hands of the postman for delivery, but remain without the slightest action being taken, until they become cumbersome by their bulk, when they are gathered in a heap and destroyed. As an illustration of the injustice of the system in force, we may cite the following, as the case to which we have alluded to above:—The collector of this journal, having called with an account at the supposed address of a subscriber, was informed that the party had left some eleven months since. With a view, then, of learning to whom the papers had been delivered, which were regularly despatched to the address through the post, he sought the postman on the round, and by him was informed that since he became aware of the party having left, the papers had never been taken by him from the post office. As the wrapper would intimate at a glance to the authorities the source from whence the paper came, and, in addition to that, it being received from our publisher securely tied in a bundle of town papers, we ask, was it too much to expect that some intimation should have been forwarded from the department, and that, instead of allowing an accumulation for almost twelve months, some such system should have been put in force as is adopted with regard to unclaimed letters. As a further illustration of the very elaborate mode of procedure, we may state that we made it our business to see the head of the department on the subject, and although that gentleman showed us a mass of the unclaimed papers, we were also