

The True Witness.

CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, AND WEEKLY EDITION OF THE "EVENING POST"

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY.

761 CRAIG STREET, MONTREAL.

By M. C. MULLIN & CO. Proprietors.

Terms (by Mail) \$1.50 per Annum in advance City (Delivered) \$2.00

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, NOV. 6.

NOTICE.

Subscribers should notice the date on the label attached to their paper, as it marks the expiration of their term of subscription.

Subscribers who do not receive the TRUE WITNESS regularly should complain direct to our Office. By so doing the postal authorities can be the sooner notified, and the error, if there be any, rectified at once. See to it that the paper bears your proper address.

Subscribers, when requesting their addresses to be changed, will please state the name of the Post Office at which they have been receiving their papers, as well as their new address. When making remittances, always date your letter from the Post Office address at which you receive your paper.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

As the expenses attending the issue of such an enterprise as the EVENING POST are necessarily large, and as for a while we shall rely upon the TRUE WITNESS to pay a part, we trust those of our subscribers in arrears will forward their indebtedness, or pay it over to our agent, who will shortly visit them. We hope our friends will the more cheerfully do this and help us in our circulation by obtaining for us new readers, seeing that the price of the TRUE WITNESS has been reduced to \$1.50, while in size it has been enlarged four columns, and is now one of the best and cheapest weekly papers on this continent.

NEW AGENTS.

Mr. J. P. Kelly, of Brockville, has kindly consented to act as our agent in the above place. He will receive subscriptions for the EVENING POST and TRUE WITNESS.

Mr. T. B. LEAHY is authorized to solicit and collect subscriptions for the EVENING POST and TRUE WITNESS.

Mr. THOMAS MALONE is our special and only agent for Kingston and Portsmouth. He is authorized to solicit and collect subscriptions for the EVENING POST and TRUE WITNESS.

Mr. THOMAS SHEEHAN, of Quebec, is our authorized agent in that city for the sale of the EVENING POST and the collection of subscriptions for the EVENING POST and TRUE WITNESS.

PERSONAL.—Mr. Thomas Carberry, Mayor of Grand River and Warden of the County of Gaspé, has arrived in this city. He has kindly consented to act as agent for the EVENING POST and TRUE WITNESS, and generally forward our interests in the Gaspé district.

OPEN TO CONVICTION.

If we have wronged Sir John A. Macdonald, as some of our contemporaries say we have, we may assure them that we are open to conviction of our error. When the Conservative press ceases writing about Sir John A. Macdonald's "liberality," and when it proves that he is liberal, then we shall be only too happy to give the Premier all the praise he deserves. The Conservative press keeps dinning into our ears the gentle manner and affable conversation of Sir John, but that is not enough for us. We want something more than promises; something more than affability. We even asked the question, "What has Sir J. A. Macdonald done to warrant us in placing unbounded confidence in him?" To this we got no answer, but "affability" and "liberality." But we think he has done enough to warrant our antagonism. He has treated the Irish Catholics with nothing short of contempt, by giving their only representative the least important position in the Cabinet; by refusing to give them a second representative; by doing less for them than the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie did, and by pandering to Orangemen "for political purposes," by taking Mackenzie Boveil into the Government. And yet we will be told about his affability, &c., &c. We want proof of liberality, and until we get it we can have no confidence in Sir John A. Macdonald.

ILLUSTRIOUS IRISHMEN.

An English contemporary a short time since tried to belittle the governing capacity of the Irish, and to draw unfavorable comparisons between Irishmen and the illustrious men that England has given to the world. Our contemporary reminded us that Ireland has had no Shakespeare, and no Burns, and no Milton, and that our best men were only illustrious in comparison with Irishmen themselves. Well, perhaps so. We certainly have not produced a Shakespeare, a Burns or a Milton, but we produced something more startling—the Penal Code. Our modest contemporary of the London press will not deny that that was one of the marvels of its time, and after being in existence for 180 years, during which time it was a crime for Catholics to teach a school in Ireland, we are sanguine that our critics will do us the credit of admitting its wonderful success. The voice of the people was hushed—education was banned, and the Catholics lived only upon sufferance. How then could we produce a Milton, a Burns, or a Shakespeare? Since 1172 Ireland has been in a turbulent condition. The country was more

than once a slaughter market. Insurrection after insurrection, terror after terror, penal law after penal law, kept the people unsettled for many a century. Catholic youths were obliged to go abroad to be educated; Protestant youths went to England. But even during all these terrors Ireland has produced a roll of illustrious men of which she need not be ashamed. Some of England's greatest soldiers were men of Irish birth—Sir Eyre Coote, Sir William Jasper, Blakeney, Eyre, Massey, Admiral Groves, who was second in command at Copenhagen, Sir George Macartney and Wellington, were all Irishmen. And Wellington's brother, the Marquis of Wellesley, was one of the ablest Governor-Generals India ever had. Later still the illustrious General Chesney, and his hardly less illustrious son, Colonel Chesney, were Irishmen. Sir Henry Laurence, who defended Lucknow, and General Nicholson, who fell at Delhi, were Irishmen, also General De Lacy Evans, who bore the brunt at Inkerman. As explorers we have Irishmen by scores—Captain Crozier, who followed Sir John Franklin, and Sir Robert McClure being distinguished amongst them. In statecraft we have Burke and Sheridan, and Canning in the English House of Commons, while in letters we have Sir Philip Francis the supposed author of the letters of Junius, the greatest marvels of the time. These are but a few among the thousands of Irishmen who served England, and names, if not as illustrious, at least brilliant, are found in her service to-day. Sir Garnet Wolsley is an Irishman, the captain of two or three of the armor-plated fleet, are, we believe, Irishmen, too, while more than one-third of the army and navy were, until recently, men of Irish birth. An Irishman, Lord Mayo, was Governor-General of India; an Irish rebel, Garvan Duffy, was Prime Minister of Victoria, Australia; an Irishman, Lord Dufferin, governed Canada; another, Pope Hennessy, is Governor of Hong Kong, and altogether the Irishmen cut a fair figure in the world, considering that it is not yet fifty years since Catholic Emancipation was passed, and that for 180 years—it is well to keep the time in memory—it was a crime to teach a school in Ireland.

THE NEW APOSTOLIC DELEGATE.

The new Apostolic Delegate, the Most Reverend Dr. Gillooly, is fifty-nine years of age. He was born at Roscommon, May 14, 1819. Like most of the Irish youths of his day, he was educated abroad. Catholic Emancipation did not pass until 1829, and until then a great number of Irishmen were educated on the Continent. He went to the Irish Seminary in Paris, and in 1844 joined the Lazarist Order of missionaries. He was not ordained until 1867, and he is thus in Holy Orders thirty-one years. He held the position of Superior of the College of St. Vincent de Paul, Cork, for some time. When the health of the Bishop of Elphin was failing in 1856, he was chosen as the Coadjutor to Bishop Brown and when the Bishop died, ten years afterwards, Dr. Gillooly succeeded to the See. His Excellency has done much good for the advancement of education and art in his diocese. He has founded a diocesan college, a seminary, a normal school, a school of art and industry, while many parish churches, and the splendid cathedral at Sligo, bear testimony to his energy. Dr. Gillooly is very popular in Ireland. He is a thorough Irish prelate, and we are sure that he will win the confidence and esteem of all classes and creeds of the people in Canada.

THE REFORMERS.

The Conservative press draws particular attention to the "ominous" circumstance of the Reform papers, "patting the Post on the back." Well, the Reform papers may as well let the Post alone, and keep their "patting on the back" for papers in harmony with their views. We are just as indifferent as to what the Reform papers say, as we are to what the Conservative papers say; we, in fact, trust none of them. In saying this much we must not be understood as doubting the sincerity or the good intentions of individuals in either party. We know well there are men on both sides of stainless reputation and who are well disposed towards every class of their fellow-citizens. We have no desire to pose as denunciators of all party influences and party ties, but that owing to the peculiar position of the Irish people, we find it necessary to look somewhat suspiciously at the doings of the two great parties in the State. We want, in fact, to do all we can to fight for better representation for our own people. We have principles to contend for which are no more Reform than they are Conservative. We have interests to fight for to which both parties appear to be more or less opposed. The Catholics of Canada want, and should have, a larger representation in the Cabinet, for one thing; and until we get it we must continue to look with doubt upon one side and the other. We must not one-half the population of this Dominion, and yet out of fourteen Cabinet Ministers we have only five. This is not enough; and no matter whether they are Reformers or Conservatives who deny us our fair share of representation, we must oppose them. We know it is "truly ridiculous" to urge representation on these grounds. Our critics tell us that we should not claim representation on such grounds at all, but they take very good care themselves to secure representation on the same basis. We would rejoice at such a state of affairs as would warrant us in placing such considerations aside. Our people should be citizens, and citizens only, but they are not treated as citizens merely, and until they are they should look upon all parties as somewhat alike.

CATHOLIC JOURNALISM IN CANADA.

The future of the Irish Catholics of Canada never looked more hopeful than it does today—thanks to themselves. A few years ago the Irish Catholics of Canada had but one paper that could be said, in any way, to fight their battles. The *Irish Canadian* was the only paper that represented their interests, and although many of our fellow countrymen in Canada did not agree with the policy that journal at all times thought proper to pursue, yet take it all in all, it was their true friend. But since then times have changed, and the Irish Catholics of Canada have made a spring to the front. Their numbers are very little increased for the last five years, but they are exhibiting more vitality and political energy than they ever appear to have done before. If the press is any indication of the power of the Irish Catholics, it is becoming more powerful and influential every day. Five years ago, as we have said, there was only the *Irish Canadian*; now there are the *St. John Freeman*, the *Ottawa Herald*, the *London Record*, the *Cardwell Sentinel*, the *Charlottetown Herald*, the *Tribune*, the *True Witness* and the *Post*. Some of these are purely party papers, it is true, but they are nevertheless Catholic, and the fact is not without significance.

PROTECTION.

How is it that nearly all the Conservative papers have ceased to write about Protection? One hardly ever hears of "Protection" now! What is the cause of this? Is it because the future is looming before their eyes, or what is it? The country must have Protection for its manufacturers or else the country will not be satisfied. Protection was the cry by which the Conservatives were swept into power. It was heard all over the land, and upon its merits the issue was decided. How then does it happen that it suddenly drops out of sight? Now, one thing is certain and that is that Protection, as understood by the people at large, will turn out to be one of the most difficult things to accomplish that any Ministry ever undertook in Canada. That it can be managed we believe, but it will require both firmness and tact; firmness with the United States and England; tact with the Maritime Provinces and the farmers. First we shall have the United States closing down upon us; then some questions of responsible government with England may be involved; then we shall have the New Brunswickers in arms; and the farming community will begin to look after its own interests in retaliating on New Brunswick. That Protection is possible, we believe; that it will advance the interest of the country we are sanguine, but that it can be carried out as quickly, or as successfully as some people appear to think, we do not think. The question of raising a revenue will bother long heads before the question of Protection is settled, but for all that the country will not be satisfied until Sir John A. Macdonald, or a better man, protects native industries.

POLITICAL FANATICS.

"A Conservative Catholic" writing to the *Kingston Daily News*, abuses the Post because the Post exposes Sir John A. Macdonald's juggling. We do not know whether "A Conservative Catholic" is a man, a woman or a child, but he, she, or it, "A Conservative Catholic" is a poor creature at best. We notice the letter at all just to fill a gap in our editorial columns, and not because of any special arguments "A Conservative Catholic" has advanced. In fact, all the argument in the letter amounts to this—"Better have no Post, if it will not support the Conservative party." This is the sum and substance of what "A Conservative Catholic," writing to the *Kingston Daily News*, says. We are not party mad and therefore we should die, or with heroic fortitude, we should pose in the attitude of a suicide and make our exit with a bare bobbin, or, more appropriately, with a quill. But let us think of this—not the suicide—but the "Conservative Catholic's" argument, for an instant. The Post was established to look after the special interests of the Irish Catholics, irrespective of any party. It was established to fight for principles and not for factions. Now "A Conservative Catholic" would have us abandon principles and take to party, or make our exit. Men, if they be men, who advance arguments such as these, would pull down God's altar for their party, and kneel before the debris and piously swear that they did it all for the glory of God and the advancement of religion. Nay, they would work themselves into the belief that they were doing a holy work. We must remember that there are political fanatics just as there are religious fanatics—political dervishes just as there are religious dervishes; and these men are stark, staring mad upon the one passion—Party above all. To us any man, or any body of men, or any party, that attempts to ignore the claims, or to outrage the feelings, of the Irish Catholic population of the Dominion, is no friend of ours. We care not who or what he, they, or it may be, we shall not hesitate to hold our own as well as we can. Party to us is a secondary consideration, and we have proved it over and over again by the position we have taken both towards the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and Sir John A. Macdonald. There is, to us, something dearer than party to fight for, although a time may come when either party, after proving itself the friend of our people, may obtain our undivided support. But that time is not come, and we fail to see what Sir John A. Macdonald has done to warrant our saying one good word about him. Does a "Conservative Catholic" think that we are to be deceived by honied phrases and oily promises, touched upon as delicately as shade touches upon a flower? Does a "Conservative Catholic" think that the polished address, the courteous refusal, or

the promise of taking our demands "into serious consideration" will blind our vision or deceive our senses? What has Sir John A. Macdonald ever done to warrant the admiration which a "Conservative Catholic" would have us lavish upon him? Let us hear how far he has advanced our interests that we may be enlightened. For years and years he promised to establish Separate Schools in Ontario, but he never did it, when in power. If he was the first to take an Irish Catholic, as an Irish Catholic, into the Cabinet, so was Mr. Mackenzie the first to have an Irish Catholic in the Cabinet and an Irish Catholic in the Speaker's Chair. The other day the Irish Catholic population of the Dominion claimed another representative, and now we hear of vague hints, about removals, &c., &c., but the other representative has not been given to us. Nay, we believe that Mr. Costigan was refused because, well, because he was Mr. Costigan. And so shall we continue to be treated so long as we have a strong proportion of party hacks among us. Give us men of independent character and we shall soon break down the barriers which block our way. Give us men who will stand by those who will stand by them, irrespective of party, and in a short time we would be able to let the light in upon the dark doings of those who are our enemies. We can understand men taking sides, and fighting for a party, but we cannot understand such political fanatics as think that either Sir John A. Macdonald or the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie the beginning and the end of all that is good in man. A man who thinks so is a political fanatic, and it is not to political fanatics that any nation can look for the healthy development of its resources. But the reason is obvious. Politics in this country *is*, and thereby hangs a tale.

WHAT WE WANT.

A time will, we hope, soon be upon us when we can all discuss principles and not insult the individuals who hold them. In all well regulated communities differences of opinions must exist. No two men on earth think alike, and political and social differences of opinion are necessary to the well-being of communities at large. In religion, Catholics and Protestants can discuss their differences without saying anything calculated to offend men of moderate views. There is no reason in the world why men cannot be good Catholics and good Protestants, and yet be good friends towards each other as well. The man who can carry religious animosities into social life is of necessity a bad citizen. It is only by knowing each other that men learn that while they may each hold strong convictions, yet the individual men do not mean to do their individual neighbors harm. It is principles they fight, and not individuals. This is a legitimate and a necessary thing to do. Differences of opinion on questions of principles must be fought out; but when these differences are reduced to individual and social war, then the difficulty and the trouble commences. We are induced to make these remarks by the fact that recent events warrant the belief that religious animosities are dying in our midst. Catholics and Protestants appear to mingle more freely; they contribute, as Christians should, to each others institutions, and the barriers which so long divided the people appear to be breaking down. By all means let each side still contend to forward the interest and advance its own views, but let it be done in a manner becoming men professing to a common Christianity. Men fighting for principles, within the limit of moderation, deserve all praise, but men who carry their warfare into every act of their lives, they are the men who do most of the harm, and against whom honest men should wage war.

MORE CALUMNIES.

The London correspondent of the *Gazette* is no friend of the Home Rule movement, nor can the paper that publishes his letters be any friend of the Irish people. Writing from London on the 17th instant, the London correspondent of the *Gazette* pretends to be wise in the affairs of Ireland. He settles Irish questions Alexandrian fashion, and difficulties which have bothered the wisest heads in Europe are, in a letter, solved and shelved by this very astute London correspondent of the *Montreal Gazette*. In the first place, we are informed that the Irish Catholic priests are opposed to the Home Rule movement! This is news indeed! We thought all the world knew that the Bishop of Limerick headed a list, which nearly 1,000 Catholic priests signed, demanding Home Rule for Ireland. We thought that the news had even penetrated as far as London, that four Catholic Bishops had openly given their adhesion to the Home Rule movement, and that not one of the Catholic Bishops in Ireland either publicly or privately opposed it. We thought that it was well known, even in London, that the priests throughout the country were to a man in favor of Home Rule in some form or other. But the London correspondent of the *Gazette* gets his information, no doubt, from English newspapers, and so he hatches it up for the public in far away Montreal. Again, we have this same correspondent, not satisfied with telling what is not the truth, he must calumniate as well, and the *Gazette* inserts the calumnies, and gives them the benefit of its circulation. Writing of the Irish people, still this same correspondent says: "There are enough ignorant irreconcilables in Ireland to secure the election of a good many Obstructionists." This is not bad. The people who at this day are more cultured, and more Christian, than the majority of English agricultural laborers or miners, are called "ignorant irreconcilables." Irreconcilable, yes, but ignorant, no! Irreconcilable as long as Irish laws are made by Englishmen, yes! Ir-

reconcilable because Irishmen see the glory of their nation gone, its substance drained away, and a land that God has blessed turned into a pasturage to feed the English market. Irishmen ask for Home Rule, Englishmen refuse them, and Irishmen become irreconcilable. Irishmen ask for Tenant Right, Englishmen refuse them, and Irishmen become irreconcilable. Irishmen ask for a grant to the fisheries, Englishmen refuse them, and Irishmen become irreconcilable. Irishmen ask for the same franchise for Ireland as there is in England, England refuses, and Irishmen become irreconcilable. Irishmen, in fact, ask that the British Constitution be extended to Ireland, England refuses, and Irishmen would be either more or less than men if they were anything but irreconcilable to British domination. They do not object to British connection with Ireland, but they do object to have purely Irish laws made by Englishmen, the vast majority of whom never saw Ireland, have no interest in Ireland, and have been too often nurtured in feelings of antagonism to everything of Irish origin. But we must pass on. The same correspondent again says that the "energy and action" promised by the Obstructionists "is exactly suited to the taste of Tipperary, Kerry and other counties where the use of the shillelagh is cultivated." And this in the *Gazette*. Is anyone surprised? What say the Irish electors of Cardwell now? First came the Jesuits, and now the Irish catch it. But it doesn't matter. Party is God, and even Catholics and Irishmen can be found who would again to-morrow honor the men who denounce both Faith and Fatherland.

THE CIVIL SERVICE.

Why are men such violent politicians in this country and in the United States? Why but because they expect positions of trust or emolument as their reward! In the United States the corruption is open, and men take sides avowedly for the purpose of making money. Of this they make no secret. Politics is a business; and from illiterate and loud-mouthed ward politicians up to candidates for Congress, men are engaged for the special purpose of advancing the interest of some party, and are very often promised a reward if their party is successful. Of this system we have many of the worst features in Canada. Here, however, the thing is done by stealth. Men will not admit that they have motives. Not at all; it is all for party! But the public is better informed. It is not for party, it is for self, that many men work. The success of party means the success of self; therefore, the personal interest of the individual is aroused, and he throws everything overboard to accomplish his individual ends. Party is God, and the world of politicians fall down and worship it. If successful, these politicians are crowded into the Civil Service, to the exclusion, or the disadvantage, of able and experienced men. Youthful barristers and friendly stump orators are placed over the heads of old servants of the State, and one political campaign may obtain a position for an inferior man while years of faithful services may go unrewarded. Political parties may not think themselves strong enough to face these evils, but some honest man will one day hold the reins of government, and destroy forever a system which is demoralizing and unworthy. No one denies the viciousness of this system, and the party that refuses to attack it, confesses its weakness and connives at a method of preferment which is calculated to place the wrong man in the wrong place.

THE EASTERN QUESTION.

As we scan the telegrams from the East every morning, the situation becomes, every day, more serious looking. This morning we learn from Vienna that England alone demanded explanation from Russia as to the movement of troops in Roumelia. All the strategic positions are, day by day, being occupied. The quadrilateral protects the rear of the Russian army, while the lines around Adrianople protect its front. Again we are assured that the "Berlin Treaty is a failure, and that a pacific solution upon the basis of that treaty is impossible." So says the *Pall Mall Gazette*, which at the same time somewhat heretically declares that "Peace must be commanded by the arrest of the reckless power which has kept Europe in commotion for years past, and now threatens to break away from all law and all restraint." Yes, but that may be a difficult undertaking. Russia is crafty, and she will not enter upon a struggle against the combined signatories of the Berlin Treaty. If she can isolate England in Europe, as she has done in Asia, then war is certain. We must, too, remember that Austria has had her part of the spoil. For her the Treaty of Berlin has already been a success. She may now not be so anxious to take sides as she was before she occupied Bosnia. Germany is silent, Serbia is nervous, France is watchful, while England is alarmed. The situation has changed everywhere during the past two months. The *Golos* of St. Petersburg says that the Russian people are eager for a renewal of the war. It thinks the crisis in the Eastern question has come; that a fresh war is inevitable. And how can we account for all this but by the attitude of the Ameer of Afghanistan, who has for the year been privately encouraged by Russia to show a bold front. And this morning, too, we have the significant news that a Russian expeditionary force has set out for "the borders of Afghanistan to punish marauding inhabitants." This is simply a Russian army going to aid the Ameer. This news must electrocute the wild savages from the Khyber Pass to the most northern limits of Afghanistan. If true, it will set the whole country in a flame, and arouse

the fanaticism of every inhabitant who lives within its limits. Here we have Russia, posing as the champion of Mohammedanism. Russian volunteers are already flocking to the standard of the Ameer, and much more is being done to assist the Afghans than the outer world knows anything about. Russia, no doubt, calculates in being able to occupy the most of the Indian army in the Afghan war, and she thinks that she will be able to meet the small home army of England and the Turks combined in Europe. Again, it is now almost certain that the expedition against the Afghans cannot do much before the spring, and this delay is all to the advantage of Russia and the Ameer. The British troops are ready, or could be made ready in a short time, while the Ameer awaits Russian assistance and the reorganization of his own forces.

SHALL WE ANNEX THE UNITED STATES?

When the New York *Herald* begins to discuss the prospect of annexing England, it is time for us to discuss the advisability of annexing the United States. If we did not do so during the Civil War it was because we were waiting for a more favorable opportunity. That time appears to have almost come. It would settle the dispute about the Fishery Award, and would get rid of the Indian war which has been, and are, a scourge to the country. In this respect alone it would relieve our neighbors of the burden of supporting a standing army, to which their republican ideas are so much averse. Again, it is now ascertained that the great American desert is a reality, and thus the impossibility of thickly settling up the stretch of land between Omaha and the Rocky Mountains must retard the progress of the country. On the contrary, the fertile belt which runs through Canadian territory, through Manitoba and the Saskatchewan Valley, invites the tillers of the soil in millions. If we annexed the United States the people of the country would, too, possess another advantage. Invasion from the North would be then impossible. Our Northern frontier gives us no trouble, a circumstance which the people of the Republic would, no doubt, rejoice at. Again, the United States would be freed from such dangers of civil war which threatened them during the late Presidential election, for the people would enjoy the protection of hereditary rule. There would be no more squabbling as to who should be leader. Her judiciary would be pure, and if we have some things in our system which require to be eradicated, yet we have no cypher despatches to account for or disintegration to alarm us. The United States have already grown too large for a Republic, and the best thing we could do for the sacred name of humanity would be to annex the Republic and save it from itself.

DRILL FOR BOYS.

The *Mail* opposes Lieut.-Col. Labranche's idea about drill instruction for the boys. It says that the time "is passed for creating a nation of soldiers with bellicose intentions." Strange language this in 1878, when all Europe is in arms, and when only a few years have elapsed since upwards of two millions of men passed through the ranks in the neighboring Republic. The *Mail* cannot expect war all the time, but when it does come, and come it certainly will some day, then Canada will be found as everyone appears to expect her—unprepared. The "time is passed, &c.," says our contemporary; the time is come when every man should be able to handle a rifle, say we. Every boy in the country should be taught company formations and the rifle exercise. What harm does it do? Produce a nation with "bellicose intentions," says the *Mail*, but we think Canada cannot afford to be an exception to the world at large. If she does, then Canada will suffer for her folly. A day will come for Canada, as it came for Russia in 1854, as it came for Austria in 1866, as it came for France in 1870, and as it came for Turkey in 1878 when the sword will be mightier than the pen. A time will, in all human probability, come when Canadians must fight for their hearths and homes; and if Canadians are not then ready—exit Canada.

THE ST. JOHN FREEMAN AND THE POST.

The *St. John's Freeman* is a paper for whose opinions we have a great deal of respect. It is, however, a party journal, and as such it, of course, endeavors to make all the capital it can out of anything and everything which can be calculated to forward the interest of Reformers. It is with no desire to cavil with our contemporary that we must now notice an article which appeared in its issue of the 28th instant, but we are anxious to put the *Freeman* right as to our position. In the first place, it says that we rejoiced at the Conservative success; indeed, that we became "quite exultant when the Tories won their unexpected victory." No, we did not become "quite exultant when the Tories won their unexpected victory," but we rejoiced at the triumph of Protection. We are no more "Tory" than we are "Liberal," but we advocated Protection before the elections, and as a matter of course, we rejoiced when Protection won. The *Freeman* says, too, that although we opposed Orangism so fiercely, yet we are willing to support a Government of which the Orange Grand Master and another Orangeman were members. Wrong again; we are not willing to support the Government in anything except the question of Protection. We are no friend either of the Chieftain who "was an Orangeman since he was eighteen," or of his Grand Master. We repeat what we have often said, that neither one nor the other of them can be the friends of the Irish Catholics. If they dare, be our