TESTIS IN CŒLO FIDELIS

# The True Witness AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. XXIX.—NO. 7. MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 2, 1878. TERMS: $1.50 per annum In advance.

## THE ORANGE LEADERS.

### The Defendants Committed for Trial at the next Court of Queen's Bench.

### THE MAGISTRATE'S DECISION.

### A FULL REPORT.

On Monday, Sept. 23, Mr. M. C. Desnoyers P. M., delivered judgment in the Orange case of which we gave a brief summary. As the whole document, however, is of interest, and will probably be of value for the purposes of reference, we give it below in its entirety.

The defendants are accused, firstly, of belonging to an illegal society called the "Loyal Orange Association," contrary to the disposition of the 10th Chapter of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, section 6th, as amended by the 29th Vic., chap. 46, section 1; and, secondly, of having, on the twelfth of July last (1878), unlawfully, assembled in the city of Montreal, for the purpose of walking in procession through certain public streets of the said city, thereby provoking a breach of the peace and endangering the lives of the citizens. The evidence, which is voluminous, goes to show, beyond a doubt, that the defendants did meet, with a number of others, on St. James street, in the said city, on the morning of the twelfth of July last, with a view to walk in procession, with regalia and badges, from the Orange Lodge rooms to Stanley Street Church; and, moreover, that their so walking in procession would not only have provoked a breach of the peace, but would in all probability have caused considerable bloodshed. As to the fact of the defendants being members of the Orange Association, no distinct and positive proof has been adduced, those of the witnesses called, who were likely able to prove it, refusing to do so, inasmuch as they could only know it by being Orangemen themselves, and their admissions to that effect would criminate them; and this view was sustained by Sir A. A. Dorion, Chief Justice, in the present case; but I do not think that there can be any doubt about it, that the defendants do belong to the Orange Order. Mr. Dunbar Brown says that he professionally examined the lease for the lodge-room of the Orange Association, and identifies said room with the lodge where the defendants had assembled on the twelfth of July, on St. James street, where and in the vicinity of which they were arrested. A proclamation had been issued in the city papers over the signature of David Grant, County Master, calling upon the Orangemen of Montreal to meet at that hall, the Orange Hall, No. 81 St. James street. On that occasion (namely, the twelfth of July), and on divers other occasions, the defendant, David Grant, acted and spoke openly as one being high in authority, on behalf of the Orange Association. At the time of their arrest the defendants wore, or had on their persons, badges and regalia, pertaining no doubt to the Association, judging from the inscriptions on some of them, two of said defendants, Hamilton and Ingram, being at the time on horseback, apparently for the purpose of marshalling the procession. The expenses for advertisements that appeared in the *Star*, in connection with the Orange Order, have been paid in some instances by the defendant Frederick Hamilton. On the morning of the 12th of July last the Mayor, Hon. J. L. Beaudry, and Alderman Nathan Mercer, having gone together to the Orange Lodge, St. James street, and having asked to see Mr. Grant, the Master, the defendant David Grant came forward, and then and there the Mayor, with a view to preserve peace, proposed to said defendant David Grant to allow the Orange Society to walk in the streets without regalia, and defendant Grant said he could not consent to that without consulting "the lodge," and Mr. Grant left the Mayor and Alderman Mercer to go and consult the lodge. Alderman Mercer saw the defendant Grant several times during the day on the flat of the Orange Lodge, and once in the room of the Orange Lodge itself. Mr. Mercer saw about two hundred persons, mostly boys, in the Orange Hall; they were partly in uniform. Alderman Mercer was allowed by Mr. Edward Bond, whom he took to be an Orangeman, to see the book fyled under the letter "H," the laws and constitution of the Orange Order, being a book similar to the one fyled under the letter "E," and was subsequently asked by Col. George Smith, "reported to be in high order in the Orange Association," why he [illegible] these books to that effect. These facts can hardly leave a doubt, but that the defendants are Orangemen. Now, does the Orange Association come within the prohibition of statute above, and which reads as follows:—"Every society or "association the members whereof are, according to the rules thereof, or to any provision "or any agreement for that purpose, required "to keep secret the acts or proceedings of "such society or association, or admitted to "take any oath or engagement, which is an "unlawful oath or engagement, *within the "intent and meaning of the foregoing provisions,*" "or to take any oath or engagement not "required or authorized by law; and every "society or association, the members whereof "or any of them take, or in any manner "bind themselves by any such oath "or engagement, or in consequence "of being members of such society or asso"ciation—and every society or association "the members whereof, or any of them, take, "subscribe or assent to any engagement of "secrecy, tot or declaration not required by "law—and every society of which the names "of the members, or any of them, are kept "secret from the society at large, or which "has any committee or secret body so "chosen or appointed that the members con"stituting the same are not known by the so"ciety at large to be members of such com"mittee or select body, or which has any "president, treasurer, secretary or delegate, or "other officer so chosen or appointed, that "his election or appointment to office such "is not known to the society at large, or of "which the names of all the persons and "of the committee or select bodies of mem"bers, and of all presidelths, treasurers, sec"retaries, delegates, adenother officers, are "not entered in a book kept for that pur"pose, and open to the inspection of all the "members of such society or association; "and every society or association which "is composed of different divisions or "branches, or of different parts acting in "any manner separately or distinct from "each other, or of which any part shall "have any separate or disinct president, "secretary, treasurer, delegate, or other "officer elected or appointed by or for "such part, or to act as an officer for such "part, shall be deemed and taken to be un"lawful combinations and confederacies." The witness, McNally, who almost admits to be an Orangeman says from the first day of this prosecution it was his opinion that "the nature of the oath and the secrecy" should be admitted. Such was still his opinion when he entered the room to give his evidence in this case, but after a conversation with the counsel, Mr. Doutre, Colonel George Smith, and the defendant, David Grant, he changed his mind and declined to answer the questions, as it was hinted to him during that conversation that the proper time had not yet arrived to make those disclosures. Mr. Dunbar Brown, in one of his answers, states that "no one but an Orangeman could know another Orangeman." Is not this clear evidence that the Orange Society is a secret one? Mr. Brown says of book E that it appears to be a copy of the Constitution and Laws of the Orange Association, and in cross-examination he quotes from the said book the aims and objects of the Orange Association, viz.:—"To promote the prin"ciples and practice of the Christian reli"gion, maintain the laws and constitution "of the country, afford assistance to dis"tressed members of the Order," &c. If that part of the book (being the general declaration) be true, the 38th section of and laws must also be true, and it reads thus: "Any "member who shall utter, print, publish or "circulate, or who shall cause to be publish"ed, printed or circulated, or to be privy to "the printing, publishing, or circulating of "any matter or thing derogatory to the Asso"ciation, or the character of any of its officers, "or any member divulging or communi"cating any matter, proceeding or thing, "or the substance or meaning of any "matter, proceeding or thing, *had or transpired "in open* Lodge, to any person not being an "actual member in attendance on some "Lodge of the Association, under warrant, "whether the facts transpired or the business "transacted were in his presence transacted "or transpired, or whether communicated to "him by a brother, or who shall publish or "cause to be published any proceedings of "the Lodge without the sanction of the "Lodge or the Grand Master given "in writing, shall be deemed guilty of "a violation of his obligation and "shall be expelled, or otherwise dealt "with as the majority of the lodge shall deter"mine." From that evidence, the least that can be said is that there exists a strong presumption that the Orange Association is a secret one, the members whereof are allowed or required to take an oath not required or authorized by law; and the duty of the examining magistrate in such a case is clear and elementary; Oke's Magisterial Synopsis, 12th Edition, Volume 2, page 919, cites the case of Cox *vs.* Coleridge, wherein Mr. Justice Bayley observed,—"I think that a Magistrate is "clearly bound in the exercise of a sound "discretion, not to commit anyone unless a "*prima facie* case is made out against him by "witnesses entitled to a reasonable degree of "credit." "Justices ought not, therefore, to "*balance* the evidence and decide according "as it preponderates, for this would, in fact, "be taking upon themselves the functions of "the petty jury, and be trying the case; but "they should consider whether or not the "evidence makes out strong, or probable, "or even a conflicting case of guilt; in "any one of which cases they should "commit the accused to trial. If, however, "from the slender nature of the evidence, the "unworthiness of the witnesses, or the con"clusive proof of innocence produced on the "part of the accused, they feel that the case "is not sustained, and that if they sent it for "trial he must be acquitted, they should dis"charge the accused." But the defendants claim that the above cited Cons. Stat. Lower Canada, Chap. 10, does not apply to the Orange [illegible] case of the Queen vs. [illegible] enacted in 1838, and cannot apply to the Orange Order, which was not in existence at the time in Lower Canada. The defendants contend, as a legal proposition, that the preamble of the said Statute 2nd Victoria, chapter 8, viz.: "Whereas, divers wicked "and evil-disposed persons have of late at"tempted to seduce divers of Her Ma"jesty's subjects in this Province from "their allegiance to Her Majesty, and to "incite them to acts of sedition, rebellion, "treason, and other offences, and have en"deavored to give effect to their wicked "and traitorous proceedings by imposing "upon the persons whom they have attempt"ed to seduce and incite, the pretended obli"gation of oaths unlawfully administered; "and whereas, divers societies and associa"tions have been of late instituted in this "Province of a new and dangerous nature, in"consistent with the public tranquility and "with the existence of regular government;" "though not recited in the 10th chapter of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, has been consolidated thereon, and that the words "which is an unlawful oath or engage"ment, with the intent and meaning "of the foregoing provisions," inserted in the 6th section of the Ordinance as well as of the Consolidated Statutes, limit the operation of that Statute to the words of the preamble. The 8th section of the first Chapter of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, enacts that, "the Consolidated Statutes shall "not be held to operate as new laws, but shall "be construed and have effect as a consolida"tion and as declaratory of the Law, and as con"tained in the said Acts and parts of Acts so "repealed, and for which the said Consoli"dated Statutes are substituted." The schedule B annexed to the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, being a schedule "of acts "wholly or partly consolidated in this volume, "and of the sections of the said Acts, showing "which of them are consolidated and where, "and accounting for those not consolidated," indicates the nine first sections of the said Ordinance 2 Victoria, chapter 8, have been consolidated under chapter 10 of the said Consolidated Statutes for Lower Canada, and that the 10th and 11th clauses (relating to publication in churches and posting in parishes) had become *effete*. The interpretation clauses, chapter 5 Consolidated Statutes Canada, section 6, paragraph 28, and chapter 1 Consolidated Statutes Lower Canada, section 13, show clearly that the preamble of the said ordinance forms part of the said chapter 10 of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada, respecting seditious and unlawful associations and oaths, and "is intended to "assist in explaining the purport and object "of the Act." Therefore, I have no hesitation in holding that the last two sections only of the said Ordinance (concerning publication in churches and posting in churches) have been repealed by the Consolidating Act, and that the first nine sections of the Ordinance, as well as the preamble thereof, have been consolidated, and consequently the said preamble must be read as forming part of the said 10th chapter of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada. But I cannot adopt the view of the defendants, that the words of the preamble limit the Ordinance to the case of the Canadian rebels. The Ordinance contemplates evidently two distinct classes of offences, viz., one amounting to a felony, and the other to a misdemeanor only. Dwarris on Statutes, page 265 and following, says and quotes:—"It is, at the same time, incontro"vertible that if the enacting words can be "shown to go beyond the preamble, (and that "they may be justifiably carried beyond the "preamble, there is no manner of doubt, if "the words be seen to embrace any other case "within the mischief sought to be "remedied,) effect must be given to "such larger words. And a contrary con"struction is declared to be unfounded, mis"chievous and dangerous. Lord Tenterden, "in the case of Halton *vs.* Cave, warily pro"nounced the legal doctrine upon this subject "in the following terms: 'The enacting words "'of an Act of Parliament are not always to "'be limited by the words of the preamble, but "'must, in many instances, go beyond it. Yet "'the words in the enacting part must be "'confined to that which is the plain "'object and general intention of the "'Legislature in passing the Act: and "'the preamble affords a good clue to dis"'cover what the object was.' The general "purview of a statute is not, however, neces"sarily to be restrained by any words introduc"tory to the enacting classes. Larger and "stronger words in the enactment part of a "statute may extend it beyond the preamble. "If the enacting words are plain and suffici"ently comprehensive, to embrace the mis"chief intended to be prevented, they shall "extend to it, though the preamble does "not warrant the construction." In Rex vs. Pierce, Lord Ellenborough said:—"It cannot "by any means be regarded as a universal rule "that large and comprehensive words in the "enacting clause of a statute are to be re"strained by the preamble. In a vast number "of Acts of Parliament, although a particular "mischief is recited in the preamble, yet the "Legislative provisions extend far beyond "the mischief recited. And whether the "words shall be restrained or not must "depend on a fair exposition of the par"ticular statute in each particular case, "and not upon any universal rule of con"struction." In Freeman *vs.* Lambert the same powerful Chief Justice said: "I "confess I am not for restraining the gen"erality of the enacting clause by the pre"amble without some reason for it." And Justice Dampier said: "I have always un"derstood it as a standing rule in the con"struction of Acts of Parliament that the "enacting clause shall not be restrained by "the preamble, if the acting words are "large enough to comprehend the case "But though the preamble cannot control "the exacting part of a statute, which is "expressed in clear and unambiguous "terms, yet if any doubt arise on the words "of the enacting part, the preamble may be "resorted to, to explain it. In truth, it then "or, in other words, recourse is had to the "primary rules of interpretation. For the "words being doubtful, the preamble is com"pared with the rest of the Act in order to "collect the intention of the Legislature, "whether they meant it to extend to a case like "that under consideration." The first part of the Ordinance was framed upon the 37th George III, chapter 123, and 52nd George III., chapter 104 and the second part, viz., from section 6th, is framed upon the 39th George III., chapter 19. The preamble and the first section of the Ordinance are almost word for word the copy of the preamble and of the 1st section of the 37th George III., chapter 123; and we find, in Russell on Crimes, vol. 1, pages 284 and 285, that under the operation of that statute in England, the same was not confined to oaths administered for *seditious or mutinous* purposes only. Says Russell:—"In one case a question was made, "whether the unlawful administering of an "oath by an associated body of men to a per"son, purporting to bind him not to reveal or "discover an unlawful combination or con"spiracy of persons, nor any illegal act done "by them, was within this statute; the object "of the association being a conspiracy to raise "wages and make regulations in a certain "trade, and not to stir up mutiny or sedition. "It was contended that the words of the Sta"tute, however large in themselves, must be "confined to the objects stated in the pre"amble, and could not have been intended to "reach a case where it was plain that the fact "arose entirely out of a private dispute be"tween persons engaged in the same trade, "and was confined in its object to that alone; "and that the general words, therefore, must "be construed with relation to the antecedent "offences, which are confined in their ob"jects to mutiny and sedition. But the "Court, though they did not, upon the "particular circumstances, feel themselves "called upon to give an express decision, "appear to have entertained no doubt but "that the case was within the Statute. In "Rex vs. Marks, Justice Lawrence said:—It is "true that the preamble and the first part of "the enacting clause are confined in their "objects to cases of mutiny and sedition; but "it is nothing unusual in Acts of Parliament "for the enacting part to go beyond the "preamble: the remedy often extends be"yond the particular act or mischief which "first suggests the necessity of the law. So, "where sixteen persons, with their faces "blackened, met at a house at night, hav"ing guns with them, and intending to go "out for the purpose of night poaching, and "were all sworn not to betray their compa"nions, and it was objected that this oath was "not within the statute, as it was not for a "*mutinous or seditious* object, and that the "statute only prohibited those oaths of se"crecy which related to some illegal act, and "that the word 'illegal' imported a crimi"nal act, and not a mere trespass, which "was contemplated at the time when "the oath was administered, it was "held that the oath was within the sta"tute, and as to the assembly itself, and its "objects, it was impossible that a meeting to "go out with faces thus disguised, at night, "and under such circumstances, could be "other than an unlawful assembly; in which "case, the oath to keep it secret was an oath "prohibited by the statute." "So where an "oath not to reveal what they saw or heard "was administered by members of an associa"tion, which was formed for the purpose of "raising wages by a general strike on the "part of its members, and for other purposes "in furtherance of that design, it was held "that it was within the 37 George III, chap"ter 123.' The *sixth section of the Ordin*ance upon which the present prosecution is based, was framed and is almost a copy, word for word, of the second section of the 39th George III., chapter 79, which was not intended to punish the Canadian rebels, but to suppress, as being unlawful combinations and confederacies the societies of "United Englishmen," "United Scotchmen," "United Britons," "United Irishmen," "The London Corres"ponding Society," *and all societies of the like nature, inconsistent with "public tranquility,"* &c. (Russell, vol. 1, p. 337.) The fact that the Ordinance, 2nd Victoria, chap. 8, as well as the Imperial Statutes recited above, makes an exception in favor of Freemasons, shows that the Legislature intended to embrace in the prohibition other secret societies which might exist; and, moreover, the further Canadian legislation (29 Vic. chapter 46), 1865, in favor of the Freemasons, at a time when the Orangemen had asserted themselves in Lower Canada, shows clearly enough that they, the Orangemen, were embraced in the prohibition. It has been argued, on behalf of the defence, that at common law it is no offence to swear not to reveal what transpires at a meeting; that the Statute for the suppression of voluntary and extra judicial oaths was only passed by the Dominion Legislature in 1874, and could not come under the operation of the Ordinance passed in 1838. Well, this Statute of 1874, for the suppression of oaths, was framed on the Imperial Statute 5th and 6th, William IV., (1835), and yet the Imperial Statutes above recited for the suppression of unlawful oaths, were enacted and enforced as far back as 1797 (37th George III.) So that here in Canada we are just exactly in the same position as they were in England, having enacted laws against unlawful oaths long before suppressing voluntary and extra judicial oaths. By the second count of the information, the defendants having so met in St. James street, on the 12th of July last, with a view to walk in procession with banners and regalia, are charged with participating in an unlawful assembly. On this subject our statutes are silent, and at Common Law, the authorities are few in number. However, I find in Roscoe, page 906: "If the meeting, from its general appear"ance, and all its accompanying circumstan"ces, is calculated to excite terror, alarm and "consternation, it is generally criminal and "unlawful. And it has been laid down by "Baron Alderson, that any meeting assembled "under such circumstances as, according to "the opinion of rational and firm men, are "likely to produce danger to the tranquility "and peace of the neighbourhood, is an un"lawful assembly; and in viewing this ques"tion, the jury should take into consideration "the way in which the meetings were held, the "hour at which they met, and the language "used by the persons assembled, and by those "who addressed them; and then consider "whether firm and rational men, having their "families and property there, would have "reasonable ground to fear a breach of the "peace, as the alarm must not be merely such "as would frighten any timid or foolish per"son, but must be such as would alarm per"sons of reasonable firmness and courage." Also first volume Russell on Crimes, page 373: "Any meeting of great numbers of people "with such circumstances of tenor as cannot "but endanger the public peace, and raise "fears and jealousies among the King's sub"jects, seems properly to be called an unlaw"ful assembly"—per Mr. Justice Hawkins. "So, in some cases, it has been ruled that an "assembly of great numbers of persons, "which, from its general appearance and "accompanying circumstances, is calcu"lated to excite terror, alarm and con"sternation, is generally criminal and "unlawful"—per Bragley, J., *in rex "vs.* Hunt, and per Holroyd, J., in Redford vs. Birley. The following is also of considerable weight in the present case:—"Orange Lodges, Canada—Opinion of His "Majesty's Attorney and Solicitor-General, "on the subject of Orange processions, "Toronto, 6th April, 1836. We are of "opinion that all processions likely to en"danger the public peace, and all process"sions having such a tendency are illegal, "and may be suppressed by civil authority. "Persons engaged in the processions of "the description mentioned, are liable to "be *prosecuted for a misdemeanor. It may* "be sometimes difficult to determine why "such processions are in themselves "illegal, or have a tendency to a breach of "the peace, and it, therefore, must rest "with the Legislature to decide how far "it is expedient to pass a law to suppress "public processions of every description, all "which is respectfully submitted. (Signed). "Robert S. Jameson, Attorney-General; "Christopher A. Hagerman, Solicitor-Gene"ral."

The defendants are committed to stand their trial at the coming term of the Court of Queen's Bench.

## OUR PARIS LETTER.

(*From our regular Correspondent.*)

HOTEL DU LOUVRE,
PARIS, Sept 12, 1878.

Formerly churches and palaces alone enjoyed the luxury of decoration, whereas now every middle-class drawing-room possesses its elegant mantel ornaments, elaborately worked candelabra or chandeliers, goblets, flower-stands and pretty faience. The desire to be surrounded with works of art is a craving which is felt by everyone, and is a sign of refined and intelligent civilization. Paris was the cradle and still remains the principal centre of the bronze industry. In the present Exhibition is noticed a formidable competition to the hitherto unrivalled superiority of the Parisian bronzes in the neighboring capital of Belgium. In the magnificent collection displayed by the Company of Bronzes, of Brussels, the anxiety of the Parisian artists to found a museum of decorative art, with the express view of developing the taste of designers, is justified. An equestrian statue of Baldwin of Constantinople, and a colossal figure in zinc, intended for one of the gates of Antwerp, gained for this company a silver medal at the Paris Exhibition of 1867. But these two specimens of its manufacture did not reveal any special characteristics. Like all such subjects, they were made not without the assistance of a sculptor, and were unaccompanied with decorative bronzes wholly designed, modelled, and finished by the company. The company did not wish to compromise by a premature display and artistic renown still in its infancy. This wise husbanding of strength is now amply repaid by its present brilliant and unexpected success.

Some of the American exhibitors have been complaining of wholesale piracy on the part of Swedish and other manufacturers, and in some cases the castings of American machines have been used right in the sand, the copyists not even effacing the pattern maker's numbers, &c. There is a reaper made by Adriance, Platt & Co., which is thus copied by a Swedish and by a Canadian firm, the copies being exhibited in competition with the original. Messrs. Fay & Co. say that a British firm has thus copied their wood-working machinery. There is one thing to say in this connection, that any machine with castings copied directly from American models will be dangerously weak, as the marked superiority of the American cast iron enables machines to be built there much lighter than is safe to copy with inferior metal.

But the worst case of "cheek" that has yet come to view is that of the "K. K. Privilegirte Homboker and Marienthaler Eisenwaaren Industrie und Handels Actiengesellschaft," of Moravia, in Olmuz. This "imperially and royally privileged" establishment shows, in the Austrian annexe, padlocks suspiciously American in model and finish, their duplicates being exhibited in the United States section by Mallory & Wheeler. Close inspection shows that these are not merely copies of this firm's American locks, but are really *made* by the Connecticut firm referred to, bearing the private numberings of that house's catalogue and numberless little unmistakable "ear marks" not so perceptible to the uninitiated.

The idea gains ground that the Champ de Mars building will not be entirely destroyed, but the two grand machinery galleries and the vestibule facing the Seine will be retained, together with most of the ornamental grounds, including the lakes and fountains. The south vestibule and the picture and industrial galleries being removed, a large space will remain for military manœuvres, and the noble machinery galleries will be converted into military magazines. The Champ de Mars is a sad, dreary place in ordinary times and almost any change in its aspect must be an improvement.

The close of the Exposition of 1878 is now gradually drawing near. It seems to be generally understood that the duration will not be prolonged beyond the 31st of October, notwithstanding the many reports to the contrary. It will probably be known in history as the greatest world's fair ever held up to this time. In a financial point of view directly it cannot, however, be considered a success. The cost to the French Government has been ninety million francs, while the fullest expectations will be realized if the gross returns foot twenty million francs. On the other hand, the beneficial results of the Exposition will be felt by the nation for years to come. Paris is the heart of France, and upon it depends the life and activity of the nation. By attracting thousands of strangers here from every part of the world, and showing to the world the beautiful results of French genius and workmanship, the old channels of trade, grown sluggish since the recent disastrous war, will be reopened, and a more healthy and vigorous life current will be infused in the nation, already so wonderfully recuperated. The results are beginning to appear even now. Work has been given to thousands of unemployed; business has improved everywhere, and the cry of "*Vive la Republique*" comes with such earnestness from all sides, that no one can doubt that the present form of Government is becoming more and more endeared to the people. Compared with the Centennial Exhibition three out of every four Americans who come to Paris ask the question "How does this Exposition compare with our Centennial Exhibition?" That is a question which they find is a very hard one to answer. The "Centennial" was as far behind the Paris Exposition in some things as this is inferior to ours in other respects. In all things pertaining to American industries and the results of a useful inventive genius, the Centennial was a wonder; but none the less wonderful is this Exposition in the amount and variety of everything beautiful and artistic contributed by France and the other nations of Europe.

Important experiments with the electric lights have been made at the Exhibition. The Lontin light was pronounced to be very successful. The price of shares in the continental gas companies has been seriously affected by these and similar trials.

One of those official returns has just appeared, which the least fastidious of the *roi le elegante* stigmatize as *degoutant*, and unfit to appear in the columns of a newspaper. The document referred to tells us that during the last year the fastidious *gourmands* and *gourmets* of Paris actually swallowed 133,061 tons of butchers' meat, 20,587 tons of poultry and game, 20,538 tons of pork and other compounds, 5,709 tons of tripe and other delicate inner meats, 25,893 tons of fish, 14,902 tons of butter, and about the same weight of eggs, 8,895 tons of cheese, 2,792 tons of oysters, and 20,358 tons of fruit and vegetables. This is the *octroi* account, and, as all the articles pay on being brought into the city, it is unquestionably correct; but it does not include fruit, vegetables, and other things addressed to individuals,—it contains, in fact, simply the market receipts. It is startling to think that less than two millions of people, half of whom are supposed to live on bread and hircocts, and the other half on *pate de foies gras, perdrix truffiers*, and *mayonnaise de saumon* should consume, in one year, 133,061 tons of coarse butchers' meat! Enough to make a vegetarian faint with horror.

LOUIS.

Chewing rapidly is said to be an effectual remedy for nose-bleeding.

The Cardinal Archbishop of Santiago, in a pastoral letter, thus condemns Liberal Catholicism: "There is but one form of Catholicism," says his eminence—"that which is represented by the Pope and the bishops, with the faithful who follow and obey them without reservation, and without arbitrary distinctions and interpretations. As to the Catholicism which is called Liberal, so often condemned by the Church, its *role* is to place bounds to the true Catholicism. Those who profess the former are with Jesus Christ; as to the latter, under whatever disguise it may hide itself, those who profess it are against him."

A NEW MINERAL.—Professor Nordenskjold, in a paper recently read before the Paris Academy, claims to have discovered a new mineral which he calls Thaumasite (the wonderful.) The substance contains at once silicic acid, carbonic acid, and sulphuric acid. The miscroscopical analysis show that the mineral is a genuine new species, and not a mixture. It appears to Professor Nordenskjold that the curious composition of the mineral is very important for a knowledge of the transformation which the materials of rocks undergo, and he is convinced that thaumasite will be found in other mines when once the attention o mineralogists has been drawn to this interesting substance.

Henry Faxon, of Buffalo, is said never to have recovered from a fright that Blondin gave him, his nervous system receiving a lasting shock. Blondin was about to start on one of his walks on a rope across the chasm below Niagara Falls. Faxon stood laughing and jesting on the edge of the precipice overlooking the river 140 feet below. Blondin, motioning to the bystanders for silence, seized Faxon under both armpits from behind, and held him for a second or two over the verge. Faxon's countenance when Blondin laid hold of him was irradiated with mirth. When Blondin drew him back and dropped him on the green sward, he sank in a heap, horror-stricken. In the next instant, Blondin, grasping his heavy balancing pole, danced out on his rope beyond the precipice, and, turning to enjoy the effect of his manœuvre, saluted his collapsed friend with a comical gesture.