

The True Witness.

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

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, OCT. 23.

CALENDAR—OCTOBER, 1878

THURSDAY, 24—St. Raphael, Archangel.
FRIDAY, 25—SS. Chrysanthus and Daria,
Martyrs.

SATURDAY, 26—Vigil of SS. Simon and
Jude. St. Evaristus, Pope and Martyr.

SUNDAY, 27—TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER PEN-
TECOST. Epist. Eph. v. 15-21; Gosp.
John iv. 46-53.

MONDAY, 28—SS. Simon and Jude, Apostles.

TUESDAY, 29—Feria.

WEDNESDAY, 30—Feria. Cons. Abp. Bayley,
Baltimore; Bps. Loughlin, Brooklyn,
and De Goesbriand, Burlington, 1853.

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 complete 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 ad-
dresses to be changed, will please state the name
of the Post Office at which they have been re-
ceiving their papers, as well as their new ad-
dress. When making remittances, always state
our letter from the Post Office address at
which you receive your paper.

UNKNOWNABLE.

Is God unknowable? The great masters
of "modern thought" say—"yes," while the
Church says—"no." Stuart Mill says that
"selfishness" is the basis of Christian morals
and the first principle of Christian action.
Tyndall and Mr. Colston have offered to
prove by statistical tables that prayer is
never heard. Lecky almost, if not entirely,
justifies what Tacitus called the faith—"a
new, pernicious superstition." Other "great
writers of morals," from Marcus Aurelius to
Mr. Bain and Mr. Buckle, hold rough
ideas of the "Unknowable," and their
teachings are, in our day, subtle
enough to cause anxiety for the coming
generations of men. But, after all, Christian-
ity has produced greater minds than Tacitus,
Tyndall, Bain, Huxley, Buckle or Froude. St.
Augustine, Suarez, Boussuet, Kepler, Newman,
were superior to the brightest minds of
"modern thought." Plato and Aristotle be-
lieved in the immortality of the soul, and they
were both immeasurably superior to Kant or
Voltaire. But because the adorable Majesty
of God is beyond the grasp of unaided reason,
men of "modern thought" therefore pro-
nounce Him "unknowable." They will tell
you that the doctrine of the Incarnation is
assumption, and yet these same men, who
doubt the Incarnation, will not doubt that
there was a battle at Arbelu or
at Metaurus. Yet the witnesses in
each case are sufficiently strong. St. Peter
and St. John speak of witnesses, "which we
have seen with our eyes and with our hands
have handled," and yet their testimony goes
for naught, but the testimony of Xenophon
and Livy are reliable, as to the battles before
mentioned, and taken as historical truths. To
prove that Christ was God would be to de-
stroy for ever the theory of the men of
"modern thought." And how can we ex-
pect to make men like Grote believe it when
he said that "if an angel were to tell me to
believe in eternal punishment I would not do
it." Even the "reason" of which such men
make so much ado, is here denied a place
in their philosophy, and they are prepared to
deny the evidences of their senses rather than
believe the doctrines of Christianity. There is
nothing more evident than the Transfigura-
tion, Resurrection and Ascension of Our Lord.
Jews and Pagans had seen Him do what no one
but God could do. They had seen Him heal
the afflicted, raise the dead, still the waves and
cast out devils. All these things they
WITNESSED, and yet "modern thought," while
accepting many incidents in ancient
history, which read like fables, yet must
deny that which of all others is most
like the truth. That there exists in all
languages evidences of the truths of Christ's
divinity, few men have ever had the hardi-
hood of denying. Reman has not been able
to shake these truths, although this "Eccle
Homo" was, according to an English Bishop,
"the most pestilential virus ever vomited
from the jaws of hell." Just as Bishop
Whately wrote an able, and to the illiterate,
a conclusive argument that Napoleon the
Great never lived, so do men of "modern
thought" wriggle over the mystery of Christ
being God as well as Man. They look upon
Christ as being a philosopher, as Socrates was
of Greece or Seneca of Rome, but they have
not yet learned the noble modesty which
faced Socrates to say near the close of
his career, "Noz unam scio, me scire nihil,"
this one thing do I know, that I know nothing.
We do not ask these men to believe theories,
but we ask them to believe facts, as demon-
strative as a mathematical calculation. But
the shallow minds that cannot explain the
mysteries of this world presume to reject the
mysteries of the world to come. We hear

everybody talk of the "great, undiscovered
forces" of electricity, &c., which is designed,
they say, at some future day to make a revolu-
tion in the world. This air, the earth, the
sea, are each full of some mysteries which
man cannot, or at least has not fathomed, and
the mind of man, puny at best, when it at-
tempts to take in space, is set at defiance by the
elements around him. But the man who
will frankly admit that he cannot under-
stand the hidden mysteries of science will not
deny that science has hidden mysteries, but
he may deny God altogether. There are thus
certain forces in science which, although not
understandable, are not unknowable, just as
there is a God who we cannot understand yet
He has existed for all time, does exist now,
and will exist forever.

COMMENCING THE BAD WORK AGAIN.

If the Post indulged in as many offences in
twelve months, as the Witness does in
one issue, we would be denounced by
bell, book and candlelight from one end
of Canada to the other. Nor would that de-
nunciation be undeserved. The instant we
offend Protestants, because of their religion,
that instant we should forfeit whatever good
opinion any class of the community may hold
of us. Without assuming to be as modest as
the proverbially blushing bride, yet we con-
fess to a sufficient degree of bashfulness to
know, that if we were betrayed, by any chance,
into insulting any man because of his religious
opinions, we would there and then skulk
through the alleys rather than walk the public
thoroughfares of the city. What the Witness
gains by such a policy it is difficult to find
out. It may please the fanatics, but it cannot
but offend people who desire to live in peace
with their neighbors. Of course the Witness
has its mission, and in that mission it is
unique. It denounces "Romanism," and
scatters broadcast assertions about "Romish"
ignorance the world over, but particularly in
Quebec, Ireland and Spain. Now, suppose we
change our tactics and act upon the at-
tack. Suppose, instead of quoting authorities
against the statements of the Witness, we
quote authorities to prove that the "clod-
hoppers" from the wolds of Yorkshire, the
miners of Durham, or the "halt savages" from
the fens of Lincolnshire were the most "ig-
norant" and the most "immoral" and the most
"besotted" creatures outside of savagdom, what
would the English people say? Suppose we,
week after week, gave proof, the proof fur-
nished by English Government commissions,
of the demoralization and the degradation to
which these people have come, what a
howl there would be against us from
ocean to ocean. And suppose further, that
we attributed all the immorality, the crime,
the ignorance, and the almost savage habits
of these Englishmen, to their religion, what
would become of us? To persist in such a
policy would be just what the Witness is
doing to us. But to do so we would be
obliged to offend a class of people
among whom we live and
with whom we are anxious to be friends.
Not that we think discussions such as these
should be avoided. By no means, but in the
present state of feeling in Montreal we think
it better to avoid any new element of dis-
turbance in our midst. If we wished we
could make it just as hot for others, as others
are trying to increase the temperature of the
atmosphere for us, but we prefer to pursue
another policy and leave it to the good sense
of the community to decide—who it is that is
commencing the bad work again?

ORANGEISM.

It must be the wish of every lover of peace
that the words His Honor Judge Ramsay used
at the closing scene of the "Orange" trials
be, not only remembered, but acted upon.
They were words of wisdom, and are well
calculated to restore that peace which we all
so much desire. Here are his words as quoted
in the *Herald* of Saturday morning—

"The defendants now know whether their
society is within the law, and if they continue
to remain in a society which is contrary to
law they put themselves in great peril, for it
may happen that a case may arise when there
is a witness there to complete the evidence.
His Honor had further to say that Mr. Carter
had carried on the prosecution in a very pro-
per manner; it is one which ought to come
before the Court, for there was a sufficient
prima facie case to justify the commitment."

This opinion was concurred in by the col-
leagues of Judge Ramsay on the Bench, and it
should settle the question of Orange parades
for ever. At first we were not aware that such
a strong expression of opinion had been given.
We had heard that it was so, but failed to
learn it authoritatively. Subsequently, we
made enquiries, and we have found that the
report in the *Herald* is substantially correct.
Thus our forecast has been verified; Orange-
ism is illegal, and we hope that, in future, we
shall hear no more of any attempts to violate
the laws of the land. If Orangemen are the
loyal men they profess themselves to be, let
them avoid all attempts at illegal parades.
If the press is so solicitous of seeing the law
obeyed, let it sustain the action of the Bench,
and decry anything calculated to outrage
the law. We must remember that the Orangemen
had "the right" to walk. That was the great
argument. All the newspapers were full of
this "right" to walk as "British subjects." Now,
if Judge Ramsay and his colleagues are an
authority, the Orangemen have "no right"
whatever. Thus the only argument which the
press could advance in favor of the Orangemen
vanishes, and we shall be curious to see what
substitute is offered. But if our Protestant
fellow citizens—the men with whom we have
no quarrel, the men for whom we enter-
tain no other feeling than friendship—if they
do not now see that Catholics want to live in
peace, then we despair of ever seeing that
good understanding which is so necessary for
our commercial advancement and social in-
tercourse. If there was an organization in

our midst, which was calculated to offend Pro-
testants as Orangeism is calculated, to offend
us, by its history and its surroundings, thou-
sands of Catholics would array themselves to
kick it from the thoroughfares if it attempted
to insult men we want to call our friends.
All such conspiracies are wicked, and no
matter who joins them, do wrong.

THE NEW CABINET.

RIGHT HONORABLE SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD,
Premier and Minister of the Interior.
HONORABLE S. L. TILLEY, Minister of Finance.
HONORABLE CHARLES TUPPER, Minister of Public
Works.
HONORABLE J. H. POPE, Minister of Agricul-
ture.
HONORABLE JOHN O'CONNOR, President of the
Council.
HONORABLE JAMES MACDONALD, Minister of
Justice.
HONORABLE L. F. R. MASSON, Minister of
Militia.
HONORABLE H. L. LANGEVIN, Postmaster-
General.
HONORABLE J. C. POPE, Minister of Marine
and Fisheries.
HONORABLE MACKENZIE BOWELL, Minister of
Customs.
HONORABLE J. C. AIKINS, Secretary of State.
HONORABLE ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, Receiver-
General.
MR. L. F. G. BABY, Minister of Inland Re-
venue.

The first six gentlemen were sworn in in order
to enable Sir John to form a quorum of the
Council before His Excellency took his de-
parture. If we are to bend to the lash of our
censors, we shall have nothing to say to all
this. There is a class of journalists in this
country who think another class of journal-
ists should be as dumb as a community of
Trappists. We are told that we outstep our
functions when we urge the claims of certain
gentlemen to a seat in the Cabinet, and we
are politely reminded that it would be better
for us to hold our tongue. We think it is
our special duty to remind Sir John A. Mac-
donald that he cannot afford to treat the
Irish Catholics with less consideration than
they were treated by the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie.
If he does, then he must be prepared to hear
of a great deal of dissatisfaction. At the
present moment the good will or the antag-
onism of the Irish Catholics of the Dominion
hinges upon what Sir John A. Macdonald
does. In this much we must not be under-
stood as indulging in any absurd threats. We
simply state what is patent to every man
in the community, and that is that Sir John
A. Macdonald will arouse a spirit of antag-
onism to his Government from the start, if he
does not at least do as much for the Irish
Catholics as the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie did.
He may trust to luck and Protection to cool
this antagonism down. He may see in the
future the means of making us forget and for-
give the neglect of to-day, but Sir John A. Mac-
donald is not starting well. It looks as if he
has shelved the Hon. Mr. O'Connor by making
him "President of the Council." This is fol-
lowing the wake of the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie,
when he shelved Mr. Anglin by making him
Speaker. This looks like the old game, and it is
such chicanery that has forced Irish Catho-
lics to look to themselves. The Hon. Mr.
O'Connor is worthy of something better than
being made President of the Council, but we
suppose Sir John's book would not allow it.
We have no liking for urging men's claims be-
cause they are of this or that religion, but we
are forced to acknowledge the fact, that we
fear we will be obliged to do so, if our people
are ever to get fair play. Sir John A. Mac-
donald can now make nearly every Irish
Catholic in the Dominion his friend, or his
enemy. Let him take his choice, and when
he does, we will then know how to take ours.
The last seven Ministers have been added
since the above was written.

THE "ORANGE" TRIALS.

The law-suit called the "Orange" trials has
ended, and the "Orangemen" have been dis-
charged. This is looked upon as a victory
for "Orangeism," when there was no
"Orange" trials, because there were no "Orange-
men" to try. They would not "criminate
themselves." They knew—or if they didn't
they ought to have known—that the Orange
Society was illegal, and being illegal, the
Orangemen declined to "criminate them-
selves," so there being no Orangemen in
Montreal the prosecution failed. The *Herald*
of this morning, in an article which betrays
the weakness of pandering to the "winning"
side, appears to think that the legality or the
illegality of the Order has been settled. Noth-
ing of the kind! That point was
not touched upon at all, and the
opinions of the four lawyers remain
intact, and we believe that opinion to be
sound. Give us the "Orangemen," and our
lawyers will soon prove them to be members
of an illegal society. Show us the men who
will admit that they are members of the
Orange Order, and, if we are not mistaken,
they will very soon be "criminated" in spite
of themselves. The *Herald* is unnecessarily
offensive in its championship of the "inno-
cent men" who were throttled by "ruffians,"
and it is illegal as well. These "innocent
men" who "wouldn't criminate themselves"
were members of an illegal society, and the
"ruffians" were by implication applauded by
the Judge for their good behavior. The con-
duct of the Mayor has been eulogized, Orange-
ism has been condemned by Protestant judges
from the Bench, and the *Herald* would have
exhibited better taste if it declined to pander
to the passions of an organization whose prin-
ciples it dare not defend. The men who
wouldn't "criminate themselves" have by
this trial gained a "success," but the Catholics
have, by the same trials, gained more than a
success—they have won a victory. Tolerant
in everything; accepting a Protestant jury
without a murmur, having no desire to punish
the Orangemen, but only to vindicate the
law, with the words of the Judge sounding in
our ears, with the conduct of the Mayor ap-
plauded, we may well close the book and be

satisfied that the triumph is ours, and the de-
feat belongs to those who, for all the world,
would not "criminate themselves." As for
the question of Orangeism, it stands just where
it did. Between it and Catholicism there
must be eternal war. Peace is, we fear, im-
possible. We would like to hope otherwise,
and we would like to see men put the law
before every consideration of self. No man
has the right to take that law into his
own hands, and the man who
does so should be punished as the law
directs. But Orangeism in this Province is
a mistake. Were it not for it Catholics and
Protestants would live in peace for ever. We
have of late had abundant opportunities of
proving that between Catholics and Protest-
ants there exists that cordial feeling and mu-
tual toleration which should be the guiding
light of all Christian communities. It would
be madness to get otherwise, and we can only
hope that that feeling will not be disturbed
by anything calculated to offend either one
side or the other.

RUSSIAN POLICY.

When Peter I., the founder of the Musco-
vite Empire, died, he, like all sensible men,
left a will. Sometimes the authenticity of
this famous document is doubted, and men
versed in the tricks of diplomacy, say that,
like Siram Holton's baby—"It is an inven-
tion, sir." But true or false, one thing is cer-
tain, and that is, that the successors of Peter
I. have pursued the policy laid down by the
founder of the Empire with religious fidelity.
Mgr. Gaume, in his work entitled "Le Testam-
ent de Pierre le Grand, ou la loi de l'avenir,"
gives strong reasons for believing
that the document is authentic, while
other writers, with more vagueness,
give reasons for believing that
the document is a fraud. But in any case,
Russian policy is indicated with a truthfulness
which has been established over and over
again. This, a reference to the Testament in
question will prove. The will commences by
a canting hypocrisy with which the world is
but too familiar, and which the Emperor
Wilhelm so impiously illustrated when writ-
ing—

"By Divine will, my dear Augustus
We've had another awful bustle.
Ten thousand Frenchmen gone below.
Praise be to God, from whom all blessings
flow."

So did Peter commit his plot to "the great
God, of whom we hold our existence and our
Crown," and forthwith the same impious pen
concocts the most disgraceful plots for the
overthrow, the slaughter, and the subjugation
of the world, that ever was plotted against
of hell. Peter said that he "found Rus-
sia a stream," but he left "it a river, destined
"by her successors to be made into a vast
"sea," whose "waves will overflow all the
dykes which the efforts of weakness may
raise to oppose them." Russia is to overrun
Europe first, and then the world. "Russia,"
says the Testament, "is to be maintained in a
state of perpetual war," and "peace will be
made to serve war," while she is to take part
on every occasion in the affairs of Europe and
the quarrels of European nations, especially
in those of Germany, which from its great
proximity, more directly concerns us. If
Russia has not pursued this policy to the
letter, it is because times have changed, not
perhaps, that her intentions were altered.
Peter I. may have been wise in his own gen-
eration, but he could not have been
wise for all time; and while his will may have
been looked upon with pride in his day, in
the light of experience it becomes shaded with
the colouring of a dreamer or a dotard. It
would undivide Poland; force Sweden to
become insolent; seek English alliances for
purposes of commerce; German matrimonial
alliances for purposes of power; and constantly
advance without intermission northwards along
the Baltic, and southwards towards the Black
Sea. Some of these plots have been accom-
plished, but the final point, the dream of the
ambition of Peter I. and his successors, "Ap-
proach as near as possible to Constantinople
and India; to rule these is to rule the world,"
has not yet been realized. In that plot, Peter
I. counted without mine host. Since his day
new powers have sprung up over the
world, and those powers never can allow Rus-
sia to obtain Constantinople and
India and "to rule the world." Peter thought
of universal conquests, and like the ancient of
whom our history tells us, in prospective he
sighed for his successors because there were
no more worlds to conquer. But yet, there is
the policy of Peter I., and there, too, we see
an attempt at pursuing that policy by Russia
of to-day, so far as modern circumstances will
permit. As to the question of its success we do
not care a button, for if it ever succeeds, it will
be at a time when our shadows will no more
darken the earth, and when the evidences of art
by which we are now surrounded will be covered
with the dust of ages, when London will be
another Troy, and Paris another Thebes. The
speculative brain of Peter I. may have con-
jured up the ways and means by which Europe
was to be subjugated, but it will take many
Peters to accomplish it. No doubt the policy
of Russia at this hour indicates a faithful
following of the will of the founder of the
Empire. Russia hovers over Turkey with, ap-
parently, paternal solicitude for her people, but with an eye of aggrandise-
ment as well. If Russia was sincere in her ex-
pressed desire to free the Christians in Turkey
from the yoke of Mussulmans—then she would
have the sympathy of the Christian world. No
doubt there may be some sincerity among her
soldiers, and the chivalry of her troops might
lead us to believe it; but that Russia was
animated solely because of her desire to
help the Christians no man with a knowledge
of her history will believe. The way she
treats her own Christian subjects is enough
to refute the statement of doing good, like

Count Frascò's gift to the organ grinder's
monkey, "in the sacred name of humanity,"
while the way she treated gallant Poland
refutes the claim of making sacrifices for the
cause of sacred Freedom. No, Russia means
aggrandizement, and whether the Testament
of Peter I. is true or not it is her policy—
Constantinople and India are the goals of
her ambition, and, if it takes ages, she will
try and obtain them.

THE EVILS OF POLITICS.

In Canada everything is prostituted for
party purposes. The great and the little
offices of the State are given to party friends;
and every department is used to advance the
interest, and to consolidate the power, of the
men in office. The absence of competitive
examination has forced the adoption of the
system of patronage, and all men come to
look upon the triumph of their party as "a
good thing" for themselves. Politics is sim-
ply a game which works upon the passions of
men through their expectancies of office. Sir
John A. Macdonald proved it when he pro-
vided for so many of his followers after he
had lost the confidence of the country, and
now Mr. Mackenzie does the same thing, al-
though in a minor degree. The fact is that
the man who gains a seat looks upon himself
as having gained, if not a fortune, at least the
hopes of one. In Canada politics is but an-
other name for money-making, and the few
honorable men who are in Parliament will
frankly admit it. Let anyone take a broad
view of the situation. Who goes to Parlia-
ment? The cream of our merchants. Is it,
as a rule, men who seek the honor of rep-
resentation? That a seat in the House of
Commons ought to be a honor all men will
admit. It should be a high distinction to be
privileged to have a voice in the making of
a people's laws. To represent a constituency
in the House of Commons for honour sake,
is a noble ambition; to represent it in order
to make money, may be regarded as sensible,
but it must sooner or later land the State in
trouble. It is true many men are disappointed
in their expectations, and many fortunes are
lost by entering politics, but the tendency of
politics in this country is to induce men to
believe that "the Party will do something for
them." Party is King, Party is power, Party
is wealth, and Party is undermining the
spirit of self-reliance which should in-
duce men to look to themselves and to them-
selves alone for advancement in the world.
Here men are educated to look to Party for
favours; in the old country they are taught
to look to no one but themselves. In a new
country like Canada we cannot, perhaps, expect
to place the honour of representation before everything.
We do not cry out against the giving of some
patronage. It appears to us that for some
years such a thing is inseparable from our
condition. But the wholesale shovelling
out of offices to party followers,
which so often takes place here, is
not only wrong in principle, but it is fatal
to the best interests of the country. The result
is that Party, and not Capacity, is taken as
the standard of merit. The scholar has to
stand outside; the too often, illiterate
politician takes his place. Education is thus
placed at a discount, and men who are pos-
sively ignorant aspire to hold the highest
offices in the land. And what is the remedy?
A very simple one, we think. If the govern-
ment of the country adopted the same system
of preferment as Mr. Mackenzie adopted in
giving out his contracts—to the lowest
tender. This included the cheapest
labor and the best workmen. What is to pre-
vent the offices, where intelligence and educa-
tion are required, being given to the highest
tender, or the man most qualified to fill them?
To such a proposition there may be a good
deal of opposition, but we all know the class
of men from whom the opposition will come.
We, for instance, know men whom we have
opposed, and yet because of their fitness and
of their ability we would rather see them in
office than men with whom we might be sup-
posed to be in sympathy. Patronage may be,
and indeed in the present state of the country
is, necessary, but wholesale patronage, irrespec-
tive of the capability of the receiver, is a
crying evil, and an evil of which both the
Reformers and Conservatives should be
ashamed.

COMMERCIAL SUPREMACY.

The *Saturday Review* recently said that "It
is quite unnecessary to announce that the
United States can, and probably will, wrest
from England the commercial primacy of the
world." The statement did not surprise the
public, for men had come to look upon the
future of America as something colossal. Mr.
Gladstone, in an article in the *North American
Review*, says that he has no inclination to mur-
mur at this prospect of American commercial
supremacy, for he says: "If she (America)
acquires it, she will make the acquisition by
the right of the strongest; but in this instance
the strongest means the best." Speculation
may be vain, but as the resources of America
appear to be unlimited, it is not unlikely that
this commercial supremacy may some day
become a fact. The resources of England
are great, but they are not great
enough to expect their continuance
for centuries. Her iron and her coal
must some day give out, but when that day
comes it will be of very little moment to our-
selves or to those who follow us for many
generations. But as men are permitted to
speculate, we must remember that America
is, according to many theorists, to become
overrun with Chinese, and it is certain
that to the future Americans, and not to the
future Americans, that the commercial
supremacy of the world is to belong. Theories
such as these may not be wild, but they are,
at best, speculative. Mr. Gladstone and the
Saturday Review may find food for reflection
in them, and what causes reflection must after
all do some good for mankind.

THE ST. HENRI SHOOTING AFFAIR.

Mystery still shrouds the St. Henri shooting
affair. Boys are shot down in the open day-
light, and no one, so far, has been found to
blame. Now it is evident to everybody that
the authorities do not want an enquiry. The
whole proceeding is a sham, and it is just as
well for us to know it. The authorities do
not want a conviction, or if they do they have
given the public a very absurd way of proving
it. Time will be wasted, the indignation of the
public will have cooled down, and the affair
will be allowed to slip from the records.
But we possess one privilege at
least which no authority can deprive
us of, and that is: the privilege of
dinning the wrong into the public ear, and of
opposing a policy of silence which is destruc-
tive to the best interests of the, may be,
turbulent society in which we live. It is not
by avoiding such enquiries that the peace of
the community can be secured. It is not by
passing over such outrages that the people
can be taught to have confidence in the
administration of justice, and to look upon
the law as the fountain head of order. Some
one has been guilty of a crime, and if there is
any law at all in the country, every means
within the power of that law should be
used to find out who that some one is. Not
to do so is to set a premium upon outrage, for
the "enquiry" now going on is but a delusion
and a fraud.

THE ORANGE TRIALS.

On Tuesday Mr. Barnard offered to try the
Orangemen before a jury composed of Protest-
ants. The proposition was a novel one, and
it must have come upon some people with
surprise. However, whether it is practical or
not, it helped to illustrate one fact, and that
is, that the Catholics of Montreal do
not object to entrust the question of
their rights into the keeping of their
Protestant fellow-citizens. We cordially ap-
prove of the suggestion, making, however,
one condition. We think that we should be
assured, that in that proposed Protestant jury,
there will be no Orangemen. To Protestants
we never have had single objection to urge,
nor an unkind phrase to use towards them,
but in a trial such as that now
pending, we have a right to expect
no Orangeman will find a seat upon the jury.
Protestants and Catholics, as such, should
have no squabbling about the Orange ques-
tion at all, and a jury of citizens, outside the
Orange order, will, we are sure, render justice
where justice is due. If, then, the defence
finally agrees, to the proposition to have a
Protestant jury, and if it can be arranged, by
all means let us have it. We are willing to
accept the verdict of such a jury in good
faith, and we believe the vast majority of
Catholics will accept the arrangement as
become citizens who trust one another to do
what is right, irrespective of creed or class
distinctions. Again, we must not forget that
the question before the Court is more a ques-
tion of law than anything else. The verdict
will in all probability be on the construction
of the law, and the responsibility of this will
rest with the Judge, and not with the Jury.
If Orangeism is illegal in the Province of
Quebec, then there is an end to it, and the
jury will have no responsibility thrown upon it.

CATHOLIC REPRESENTATION.

Some of our contemporaries think that no
man should be appointed to an office because
he is a Catholic, no more than a man should
be appointed because he is a Protestant or a
Jew. In theory this is right. The best men
should be taken irrespective of class or creed
distinctions. We hope, too, that the time
is fast approaching when this theory will be
put into practice, and that we shall hear no
more of appointments being given because of
anything but fitness. This is the theory, but
not the practice. Irish Catholics have been
somewhat unfortunately circumstanced. They
came here, flying from pestilence and evic-
tions. They came poor and friendless. Their
first days were days of hardships, and the bread
they ate cost them many a struggle. They
could not compete with their surround-
ings, because they were comparatively illit-
erate. For 180 years it was a crime to teach a
school in Ireland, and the immigrants who
came to this country were suffering from the
consequences of this policy. Years went on,
and they were still engaged in a struggle for
bread. They became well-to-do, and, in many
instances, independent. Yet the prej-
udice originated because of their poverty, and
even when they outlived that poverty, yet the
prejudice too often remained. They tried to
become good citizens, but they were very
often prevented by the systematic antagonism
they received. They often combined in order
to obtain representation, and thus to combat
the evil spirit which was opposed to them.
Sometimes they succeeded, and by degrees
they came to be respected, because they were
strong, and because, too, other people learned,
meanwhile, to understand them. Englishmen
and Scotchmen had a long start of them.
These latter did not require to combine
because they had things pretty much their
own way. The House of Commons was full
of them. Irish Catholics saw their own
disadvantage. They were numerous and
not without wealth, and they naturally
clamored for representation. They now
number one-eighth the population of the
Dominion, and we do not see anything
unreasonable in their expecting representa-
tion in proportion to their numbers. It may
be all very well for others to decry their de-
sire, but if these others were in the same
position as the Irish Catholics; if they had to
struggle for any representation at all; if they
had to fight the battle which unhappily fell
to the lot of Irish Catholics abroad, they,
too, would desire to have some men.