

THE ORTON DEBATE.

cepted the statement as to Orton being an unfortunate nobleman languishing in prison without considering the facts. Four judges, two juries, the law officers of two Governments, two home secretaries and the press, have unreservedly pronounced the claimant to be a vile impostor, and it is somewhat surprising that any person should have believed that all the authorities were wrong and Dr. Kenealy right. Now the House of Commons has, with unprecedented unanimity, endorsed the verdict of the judges, juries, law officers, home secretaries and the press, and those who henceforth believe in Dr. Kenealy's assertion as to the convict Orton must be crass boobies. We are glad that Mr. Whalley insisted on a division. It might have been asserted that there were a dozen or a half a dozen members of the House who had some doubt upon the question. But the division of 433 to 1 is conclusive. If Dr. Kenealy has the effrontery to assert that the 433 members of the House who voted against his motion are either fools or rogues—are either too stupid to form a correct opinion, or are the corrupt tools of Mr. Whalley's Jesuits, and he gets a little mob to believe him—it will be melancholy to reflect that there are so many idiots at large.

In one respect Dr. Kenealy's speech surprised us. We knew, as everybody knew, that he could not adduce a tittle of evidence to justify his infamous calumnies about the judges, and notably about the Lord Chief Justice, but we expected that he would have made some altogether novel statements, however ludicrous and unfounded they might be. What he said about the judges does not call for a reply, and he did not attempt to support his charge of corruption. Therefore, it appears that Dr. Kenealy has not even the poor excuse that he has been self-deceived, but he has been going about the country, and in the columns of a newspaper associated with his name has been calumniating the judges without having any fictions to sustain his charges. One of Dr. Kenealy's charges against the Lord Chief Justice must have amazed the House. According to the member for Stoke, the following dialogue took place during Dr. Kenealy's address to the jury:—

"The Lord Chief Justice: If you had a large sum of money in your possession, and a robber

took ten shillings from you, and asked if that was all you had, would you not answer 'Yes'?"

"Dr. Kenealy: No, my Lord, I would not. (Laughter.)"

"The Lord Chief Justice: Then you don't agree with Dr. Johnson, who was one of the greatest moralists that ever lived, and who said, 'There are occasions when people have no right to expect the truth from you.'"

"Dr. Kenealy: I repudiate such language with horror, and I am sorry to say that Dr. Johnson should have committed himself to it."

"The Lord Chief Justice: I am not. It simply means this: every rule, however sacred, may have exceptions."

"Dr. Kenealy: I don't think there can be any exceptions in a question of truth."

"The Lord Chief Justice: I don't believe it."

If thieves read the Parliamentary Intelligence they must necessarily admire Dr. Kenealy. How much better the labour of the burglar would be rewarded if he had to plunder people of the Dr. Kenealy persuasion. A servant awakened by a burglar would inform the midnight visitor about the plate, money and jewels of her master. Another of Dr. Kenealy's charges was yet more extraordinary. On June 19, 1871, the Lord Chief Justice dined with Mr. Milbank, M.P., and Mrs. Milbank asked the Chief a question about the trial in the Common Pleas, and the reply was, "I cannot give any opinion, as I may have to try it." The lady said to the Lord Chief Justice that Lord Rivers believed so firmly in the claimant that she believed he would never give him up even if he were found guilty. The Lord Chief Justice then said—and the House might readily see in a laughing and joking way, and the Lord Chief Justice did not know Lord Rivers at the time—"Present my compliments to Lord Rivers, and tell him that in that case he will probably have to accompany his friend to penal servitude." This jest was twisted into an assertion that the learned judge had said that he would send Orton to penal servitude if he tried him. The perversion is not the worst part of the incident. The infamy is that any use should be made in public of any part of a private dinner conversation. Lord Rivers, writing to Dr. Kenealy, says: "I certainly had a right to expect that the usage among gentlemen and men of honour would not have been departed from by you, and that a private communication, especially where a lady was concerned, would have been considered sacred;