

the question occurs—how can a Volunteer be an Orangeman at all. Once under arms the provision of the Queen's Regulations extend to every man in the force. While acting as a Volunteer, no man can, according to the regulations, be an Orangeman. On duty a Volunteer is supposed to know no party. Orange Lodges are not allowed in the army, and yet we have, it is said, companies of Volunteers in which every man is an Orangeman. Here are the Queen's Regulations upon the subject: FORMATION OF ORANGE LODGES OR OTHER MEETINGS OR SOCIETIES.

General Order.

Horse Guards, 31st August, 1835.

Lord Hill has reason to apprehend, that the Orders prohibiting the introduction of Orange Lodges into the army, have not been duly communicated to the non-commissioned officers and privates, or, if communicated, that they have not been sufficiently explained and understood.

His Lordship now refers commanding officers of regiments to the Confidential Circular Letters of the 1st July, 1822, and 14th of November, 1829, upon the foregoing subject; and declares, that any officer, non-commissioned officer, or soldier, who shall hereafter institute or countenance an Orange Lodge, or any other meeting or society whatsoever, for party purposes; in barracks, quarters, or camp, shall be brought to trial before a general court-martial for disobedience of orders.

His Lordship, moreover, peremptorily forbids the attendance of either officer or soldier at Orange Lodges, by whomsoever, or wheresoever held.

The present Order is to be read to the troops periodically on the parade with the Articles of War. By command of the Right Honourable,

GENERAL LORD HILL, Commanding-in-Chief.

JOHN MACDONALD, Adjutant-General.

This order is in force at the present moment and it behoves the military authorities to institute a vigorous enquiry into the charge brought against the volunteers—that some of them have shown sympathies with Orangemen, and have openly evinced their approval of Orange displays.

To the Editor of the TRUE WITNESS.

DEAR SIR,—Having heard and read a great many discussions on the subject of the unsoldierlike conduct of the volunteers on the 16th inst., and in nearly all cases being denied by the officers commanding, I would merely give a few facts, which can be proved without doubt. On Thursday, the 12th inst., before the men of the Victoria Rifles were dismissed, Lt.-Col. Fletcher addressed them, and at the conclusion of his remarks called for "three cheers for Her Majesty the Queen," which were no sooner given than a man from the ranks called for "three cheers for King Billy," which were taken up with the same warmth by the whole corps, with the exception of quite a few, who I suppose were Catholics.

A MEMBER OF THE CORPS.

FALSE REPORTS.

On last Saturday week what purported to be an authorized report of the proceedings which took place at a meeting of the Irish Catholic Union appeared in the *Star*. Doubting the authenticity of this report, we did not publish it. The report was copied from the *Star* into the *Witness*, where it appeared under the knowing heading of "A nut for the Editor of the TRUE WITNESS to crack." We heard from many sources that the report was not true, and in our last issue we called the attention of the Catholic Union to it, without offering any opinion of our own. In reply we received the following letter:—

Montreal, July 27th, 1877.

To the Editor of the TRUE WITNESS.

DEAR SIR,—In the TRUE WITNESS of this week the attention of the Irish Catholic Union is called to a report of proceedings published in the Saturday edition of the *Star*, which purported to be a resume of what took place at a meeting of the Union the previous evening.

Now, Sir, the facts of the case are as follows:—At that meeting of the Executive a resolution was passed tendering a vote of thanks to the Council for the very efficient manner in which they had performed their duties during the passed year. This was done because it was the last time the Council and Executive would meet, and besides it is what is done every year in all the societies. In order that there can be no mistake, I wish to state that the Montreal Irish Catholic Union have the utmost confidence in the management of the TRUE WITNESS, and fully endorsed every line and every sentence that appeared in last week's issue. In conclusion, rest assured that if our daily Catholic paper, which we are bound to have, is only as true an exponent of Irish Catholic feeling as the TRUE WITNESS is, it must and will prove a grand success.

I am, dear Sir,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. McEVINER,

President Irish Catholic Union.

We think our contemporary will admit that the "nut" is now cracked, and if this is not sufficient, we can furnish even stronger evidence that the report in question was false, unauthorized and malicious.

"ROWDYISM."

The *Gazette* is going from bad to worse. Under the heading of "Rowdyism" it prints an editorial attacking certain people at Point St. Charles for assaulting a Mrs. Campbell. The *Star* and *Witness* have confessed that they were misinformed, that the whole affair was a joke—a *cheravari*, in fact. But the *Gazette* became indignant over the "Rowdyism." The fact is that a few boys rattled a few old tin cans outside the house of an "Orange lady," whose character—well we shall say nothing about that. The report was of a most sensational character. All Montreal thought that there was a little insurrection at Point St. Charles. Sergeant Richardson hurried to the scene of the engagement with 28 men. They were taken to the scene of action in cabs, and found, when they arrived there, nothing. Again the New York correspondent of the *Gazette* writes about the

"socialistic leaders of Germany and Ireland assisting in promoting the riots in America." Now, whoever heard of a "socialistic Irishman." The creature is unknown. Ireland is perhaps the most conservative country in Europe, and it is something new to hear of "socialistic Irishmen." Some time ago, when a member of the International tried to establish his "liberty, equality and fraternity" association in Cork, he had to fly out of the city. "Socialistic Irishmen" indeed. It is strange that the *Gazette* will keep knocking its head against stone walls.

THE FIRE BRIGADE.

The Catholics of Montreal number about three-fourths of the population, yet they do not hold one-third of their legitimate influence. Let us take the Fire Brigade as an example. Here is a communication we have received upon this subject:—

The Montreal Fire Brigade is composed of sixty-two (62) men, including three (3) chiefs. There are eleven (11) stations, four (4) of which are manned by French Catholics (Nos. 4, 6, 8 and 11)

No.	11 Men.	9 Protestants.	2 Catholics.
No. 1	7	—	—
No. 2	7	—	—
No. 3	5	—	—
No. 4	5	—	—
No. 5	4	—	—
No. 6	4	—	—
No. 7	4	—	—
No. 8	5	—	—
No. 9	4	—	—
No. 10	4	—	—
Three Chiefs	2	—	—

Making a total of 33 Protestants to 26 Catholics. There were six men killed at St. Urbain street fire, five Protestants and one Catholic. Their places were filled by six Protestants. Since then the brigade has been strengthened by four men—two Protestants and two French Catholics.

The first vacancies in the brigade have been applied for a long time ago by respectable Catholics, but Protestants, whose applications have been sent in from two to four weeks, had been accepted.

Several Catholic applicants have asked Alderman McCarbridge why their applications were not accepted before others of a much later date, but could get no satisfaction. It is evident that Catholics have no show to get in the brigade, there being a ring between the two Protestant chiefs and the Protestant guardians of the brigade.

Catholics are put aside in this as in every thing else. Catholics apply and are refused. Protestants apply and are accepted. This is too bad. It is working more mischief than the authorities are aware of. It is making a war of creeds in our city. And we are asked to be silent all the time. We must rest and be thankful. The true friend of peace and order is the man who will redress grievances and not hide them. But the Catholics of Montreal are awakening to a sense of their insecurity on the one hand and to their attempted ostracism on the other. We hope that some of our friends will interest themselves in this Fire Brigade question, and now that four new engines are about to be added to the Department, we shall expect that one-half at least of the twelve men who may be required, will be Catholics.

THE CAMPBELL CASE.

The assault on the house of Mrs. Campbell turns out just as we expected. The *Gazette* in the most reckless manner almost manufactures the sensation on the strength of its respectability, the affair is telegraphed all over Canada, and next day the *Star* came out with almost a flat denial of the whole affair. After this one would think the *Gazette* would enquire and explain, but no, next morning it is as reckless and untruthful as ever, building its airy sensations upon a fabrication.

Says the *Gazette* of the 30th:—

"The assault on Mrs. Campbell, one of the witnesses in the Elliott shooting case, on Friday night was described to our reporter yesterday afternoon as the assault of a crowd of roughs who threw stones and fired two revolver shots at the house. The house in question is situated in an enclosure, and an attacking party would have been compelled to throw stones fifty or sixty feet in order to strike the house. Her husband states that he had to climb over the gallery and escape through a neighbor's house in order to alarm the police. When the police came there were still present three or four of the gang, whom he asked to arrest; but none of them seemed very willing, and by the time Sgt. Richardson arrived all was tranquillity. Last night about 9 o'clock the relief police were again called out and the place was patrolled, but no further riotous demonstration was made. Sergeant Richardson is to be commended for the promptitude he displayed in getting to the scene of what was pictured to him as a disturbance on a large scale in the remarkably short space of time he did. He was aroused from his sleep, having been off duty at the time, and he certainly could not have displayed more zeal had he been on duty. All he had to guide him was the knowledge conveyed to him that there had been an outrageous assault committed—all the more reprehensible on account of the principle involved—and his promptitude is in marked contrast with the laxity often displayed. He has been found fault with on the ground of extravagance by an officer who ranks him in his official position on the force; but he has the gratitude of a large number of citizens to whom law and order are of more value than the paltry dollars it cost to convey the police to the scene of the disturbance."

THE ALLEGED MOBBING OF MRS. CAMPBELL'S HOUSE—THE STORY PROPOSED A FICTION.

A good deal of consternation has been produced in the neighborhood of Mrs. Campbell's residence, near Wellington Bridge, by the statements in the daily press on Saturday last, that her house had been assailed by a violent mob on the night preceding. A number of most respectable and, in every way reputable, citizens have called upon us this morning to give an unqualified denial to the whole story as related by the Campbells.

One gentleman, with whom we are acquainted, and who lives contiguous to the Campbells, states that he was at home on Friday evening, and if there had been any congregation of persons, or disturbance of any kind in the vicinity, he must have heard it, and as for pistol shots being fired, he pronounces it a pure fiction. He was also speaking with two policemen on the beat, who declare that no disturbance had occurred. A correspondent, writing under the nom. de. plume of "Veritas," but for whose entire "credibility" we can vouch says:

"Your report in Saturday's *Star* of a house mobbed about 9 p.m. near Wellington street, has taken us all by surprise. There are but three

buildings on Canal street, two of which, Mrs. Campbell's and another, are between Condoe and St. Etienne, and the other is on the next block. I have conversed with the residents in these two houses, and they inform me that they heard no noise or pistol shots on Friday night. I think Mrs. Campbell is drawing on her imaginations or trying to manufacture public opinion in her favor for some cause best known to herself."

The residents of the neighborhood are jealous of its good name and do not desire to have it taken away without just cause. It would be well for the Police Committee to adopt the suggestion of "A Resident" and hold an enquiry, when the truth could be elicited about this latest riot, and the character borne by Mrs. Campbell in her own neighborhood could be properly ascertained.

Again the *Gazette* returns to its work on the 31st, and half ashamed acknowledges:—

"It is denied by many persons that there was any assault committed upon Mrs. Campbell's house. It is asserted by others that the assault was committed, if committed at all, by a gang of small boys with more mischief than dire results intended. Mr. Campbell still sticks to it that he had to escape out of the house over the premises of another man who lives next door; says the police who first arrived never went to the canal bank at all, and consequently cannot know who were or who were not in attendance; that they refused to make an arrest. The police, on the other hand, say the Campbells are troublesome people, who get drunk and cause trouble, and that they are well known to them. There was not the appearance of anything unusual about the house when visited by our reporter, save that poverty and respectability seemed to reside together in the premises."

We are impatient to see if the Press of the country will give vent to this piece of stupidity. In the meantime we would enquire if Sergeant Richardson can almost suspend the *habeas corpus* act when he pleases.

THE RECENT TROUBLES IN THE CITY.

SIR FRANCIS HINKES'S LETTER.

(Continued from Second Page.)

I have endeavored to convey to your readers the cause of what people, who are ignorant of facts, believe to be an unaccountable hatred to Orangemen on the part of Irish Roman Catholics, and I shall now advert to the introduction of Orangism into Canada. If I am not mistaken, it is about fifty years since Orange lodges were first established in Upper Canada, now the Province of Ontario. It is a singular fact that although the Canadian lodges obtained their warrants from Ireland, no attempt has ever been made, so far as my knowledge extends, to give effect in Canada to the fundamental principle of the order, viz., "Protestant ascendancy." On the contrary, the members of the Orange society became first known as a power in the State by lending their aid to the old Tory party of Upper Canada in the great contest for the establishment of "Responsible Government." Those acquainted with Canadian history must be aware that the most active supporters of Responsible Government, both in and out of Parliament, were Protestants, and although the majority of Roman Catholics acted with the Liberal party, there was a sufficient number of influential Catholics on the other side to prevent the introduction of the religious element into the controversy. On several occasions the Orangemen took an active part in the political warfare, breaking up public meetings by violence and exciting a very strong prejudice against them in the minds of the Protestant as well as the Roman Catholic Reformers. In October, 1839, a meeting of the inhabitants of the County of York, convened to consider the Earl of Durham's report, was dispersed by a body of men consisting chiefly of Orangemen, armed with pistols and other weapons. The meeting consisted almost exclusively of Protestants. I have before me a list of a committee of 25 appointed to procure signatures to the address to Her Majesty, and there is only one Roman Catholic name among them. I mention this, not at all to revive the old quarrels of nearly 40 years ago, but to establish the fact that Orangism was introduced into Canada not with the view of establishing "Protestant ascendancy," but to oppose a reform, the advocates of which were habitually charged with disloyalty. I am charitable enough to believe that those who joined the Orange Lodges really believed that their opponents were disloyal, and that in resorting to the violent measures which they adopted they were merely acting in accordance with the principles which they had imbibed from infancy, and which led them not to tolerate free discussion. So violent had been the conduct of the Orangemen during eight or ten years prior to 1843 that in that year Mr. Attorney-General Baldwin submitted to Parliament two bills—one to prohibit party processions, the other to discourage secret societies. Both bills passed the Council and Assembly, but only one, that against party processions, became law, the other having been reserved by Governor Sir Charles Metcalfe. The Party Processions Act was carried by 45 to 9, and of these 45, 23 were Protestants and 16 Roman Catholics. It may well be mentioned that Mr. Baldwin, with the concurrence of his colleagues, was most anxious to follow the English precedent of 1833, and to proceed by an address to the Governor requesting him to discourage secret societies. Sir Charles Metcalfe, who would have much preferred taking no action whatever, was unwilling to commit himself by answering an address, and accordingly suggested legislation. The Ministry yielded the point very reluctantly, not being apprised by Sir C. Metcalfe of his intention to reserve the bill. It was carried through both houses, but having been reserved never became law. In the year 1851 the Party Processions' Act was repealed, and it is very important that Orangemen should bear in mind the circumstances of that repeal. A bill having been introduced for that purpose, the Government offered no opposition to it, and did not even divide the House on the second reading a division was taken, merely that those who retained their old opinion might have an opportunity of recording their adherence to them. The division was 38 to 10, but of the 38, 18 were supporters of the Government, and of these no less than ten French Canadians and Roman Catholics, among whom were Mr. Tache, Mr. Drummond and Mr. Cartier. I acknowledge that I voted myself in the minority of 17 with Mr. Lafontaine, and some others who had been parties to the Act which was to be repealed. We, however, gave silent votes without attempting to obstruct the measure, which, it was hoped, would allay the irritation which had been created. Since that time Orangism has been extended throughout Ontario, and to some extent in the Province of Quebec. Assuming that I am correct in believing that Canadian Orangemen have wholly abandoned the fundamental principles of their Order, then I must confess that I fail to comprehend the object that they seek to attain, for they no longer act in concert in the political questions of the day. I have looked through the sermon of Mr. Dondiet who cannot be so ignorant as to be unaware that the hostility to Orangism is founded on its leading principle of "Protestant ascendancy," and its known bias in favor of penal laws against Roman Catholics. Though he never alluded to the penal laws, he professed to believe that the cause of irritation was that "Irish Catholics" imagine that by this celebration we wish to throw a slur upon the bravery of their co-religionists who fought at the Boyne." I believe that a great number of Protestants in Montreal are under the same

delusion. I have no doubt that the articles in the *True Witness* have caused much irritation, and that the defiant tone adopted by that journal is not calculated to allay the irritation which exists among Protestants generally owing to the unexpected outrage on the 12th inst. It is, however, a mistake, to imagine that the editor can intensify by any language of his own the feeling against Orangism which has prevailed among Irish Catholics universally since the first establishment of the order, and for more than a century before against those who entertained Orange principles. It is desirable in my opinion, that it should be clearly understood by the Protestant population of Montreal, including the Orangemen themselves, what will be the inevitable result of the threat which they have held out to insist on the celebration of the 12th July in Montreal. Instead of hazarding any conjecture of my own on the subject, I would implore my Protestant fellow citizens to study Irish history from 1790 to the Union with Great Britain in 1800; and to ask themselves if they wish that they and their Roman Catholic fellow-citizens should entertain towards one another the feelings which animated the Orangemen and Catholics of Ireland during that period. I own that I have read with indignation that at a meeting of Orangemen in the city of Toronto, a foreigner from Buffalo in the United States was not only permitted but was encouraged to declare that foreign Orangemen would come to Montreal next year to form part of an army of 20,000 men which has been demanded by the Orangemen of Montreal. This foreigner was selected to read the demand for aid, and took it upon himself to pledge that it would be afforded, and I have not noticed any condemnation of his conduct in the Toronto newspapers. I know that the duty of the Dominion Government will be, and I can hardly doubt that it will be reminded of it during the next session of Parliament. If any foreigners dare to pollute the soil of Canada, whether they are Orangemen or Fenians they must be met on the frontier and dealt with summarily. The United States Government, moreover, should be warned of its duty to Great Britain should any of its citizens conspire to perpetrate such an outrage. My sole motive for addressing the public in your columns is because I have no confidence in the suggestions which have been very generally made with the object of restoring harmony. Those suggestions have been the prohibition by law of all processions. Personally I should rejoice at the abandonment of processions of every description. I shall, however, state the reasons which lead me to think that it is unadvisable to attempt such a remedy. The national processions are harmless and only annoying inasmuch as they occupy the streets, and involve a day's idleness to a great number of labourers. The processions which really cause any annoyance to Protestants are the Roman Catholic processions, which are certainly not intended to give them offence. I presume that in point of fact they do not give any annoyance whatever to the great majority of Protestants, but I can readily conceive that to Orangemen, and those who sympathize with their views, it is vexatious to find that the religious processions of Roman Catholics are not prohibited by law. Is it probable, however, that the Legislature could be induced to pass a law to prohibit such processions? I feel assured that the answer must be in the negative, and the Orangemen must be aware, from their own feelings, that it would be an unwise course to agitate for a law on the subject. But I have a further objection to legislation. It has been tried already, and the Orangemen have refused to obey the law. The Orangemen are fond of charging Roman Catholics with owing a divided allegiance to the Queen and to Pope, but lay themselves open to the charge of owing a divided allegiance to the Queen and to the Orange Society. It is the imperative duty of loyal men to obey the law, but Orangemen have not obeyed any law forbidding them to march in procession with banners and badges. After the experience of the past, I look on it as quite useless to legislate against Orange processions. I may add that legislation against processions in Ontario would be wholly impracticable. Can, then, no remedy be found for the impending evil? But one, in my judgment, which is to revert to the state of things which existed two or three years ago. I shall not enter on the question of the legality of the Orange Lodge which has been raised of late. It is a most remarkable circumstance that the existence of Sir John Colborne's ordinance, framed probably by Sir James Stuart or Mr. Attorney-General Ogden, seems to have been unknown to Canadian politicians a few years after its enactment. It is most fortunate for the Orangemen that such was the case, as, in all probability, it would have been extended to Upper Canada in 1813 with very little opposition. For my present purpose I prefer assuming the legality of the societies, and, as a consequence, their right to walk in procession. It is, however, by no means necessary that men should exercise all their rights, and Orangemen in Montreal may fairly be called on to adopt the policy invariably followed by the Irish Orangemen, for whom, at least, they profess respect. Now, that policy has been never to celebrate the 12th July in cities or towns where the great majority of the citizens are Roman Catholics. Canadian Orangemen should no more think of celebrating the anniversary in Montreal than Irish Orangemen in Dublin, Cork, Limerick, or Waterford. Though I should not presume to call on Orangemen to adopt a course that is not sanctioned by the practice of their own order, I venture to hope that most of them will have some regard for the opinion of their fellow Protestants. Now I learn from the sermon of the Rev. Mr. Dondiet, as well as from the speech in Toronto of a Montreal Orangeman—that the Lodges were much aggrieved by the refusal of the Trustees of Protestant churches to grant their use for an Orange service on the 12th. Mr. Dondiet says, "Every one asked for was refused if the contemplated procession, which we have the undoubted right to make, took place." A stronger indication could hardly be given of the Protestant sentiment of Montreal. It is a singular circumstance that I have not observed that the Orangemen have had a service in Church with a violent anti-Popery sermon anywhere but in Montreal. In Toronto they went to the Park and had speeches, and the day was observed elsewhere in a similar manner. I would earnestly advise all Protestants, but especially the Protestant clergy of Montreal, who must exercise a large influence over their flocks, to use it for the prevention of Orange celebrations in Montreal. It is admitted that these can only be observed successfully with the aid of strangers from Ontario cities. Common sense and Christian charity should teach those who are anxious to observe the day, to go to the places where Protestants are in the majority, as one of their number went to Toronto. I regret very much to find that an opinion prevails among some Roman Catholics that the Protestant clergy are insincere in their opposition to Orange processions and that they secretly encourage them. Such I feel convinced is not the case, but I must confess that I doubt whether they have ever exerted their influence against them with the same zeal that they have displayed in the cause of temperance and other reforms. I would implore them to reflect that no body of strangers introduced here, however numerous, will keep the Catholics down beyond the brief period of their stay in Montreal, whereas their presence will inflame the bad blood that will have been created. Furthermore, let it not be forgotten that although on Monday, the 16th, the Orange procession was prohibited, well as it is possible that any such procession could be, before night poor Elliott was shot, and might have been killed just as Hackett was. If the threats that

have been made, I trust at a moment of natural excitement, be carried out, we shall have in Montreal, as formerly in Ireland, a 12th of July from the 1st of January to the 31st of December. I am persuaded in my own mind that nothing short of the abandonment of the celebration of the Orange anniversary, will secure peace. Macanlay justly held up to ridicule a Protestant ascendancy of ribands, fiddles, statues and processions, but, in my judgment, a fanatical sermon is a more serious affair. I am unable to judge of the feelings of Roman Catholics on the subject, but I know that if I were one, and had to submit to the humiliation of enduring the insults of the representatives of a body which had trampled on the rights and liberties of the people of my race and religion for centuries, I would ten times sooner endure the insult of the ribands, the fiddles, the party tunes and the favorite expressions, "To hell with the Pope." "We'll kick the Pope before us," than the greater one of reading in the public journals, such a fanatical sermon, as that which was preached to the Orangemen of Montreal on the 12th inst., and published in all the leading newspapers of the city. The ribands, the fiddles, the flags, and the tunes, might be treated with contempt by sensible men, who know that the hydra-headed monster Intolerance will never be suffered to rear its head on the Continent of North America, but the fanatical sermon is calculated to excite the worst passions of men, already exasperated by the old feuds of their unhappy country. I will write strongly, because I feel that there can be no half measures about the Orange celebration. If the Protestant Clergy of Montreal are unable or unwilling to control their congregations my conviction is that the consequences will be such as will be regretted by generations yet unborn. I have scarcely referred to the catastrophe of the 12th July, not that I shrink from the discussion, but because, under the circumstances, I have preferred dealing with the question of Orange celebrations in a city chiefly inhabited by Roman Catholics, on its own merits and free from the complications of a casualty which ought not, in my judgment, to influence the decision. The simple question for solution is whether it is, or is not, expedient for Montreal Orangemen to celebrate the 12th of July. My conviction is that they ought to imitate their brethren in Dublin, Cork, and other cities similarly situated, and if this be the prudent, and I may add, the Christian course, the late unfortunate occurrence should not be allowed influence them to take a different one. The bitter feelings which subsist at present will subside in the course of time. I deprecate all attempts to throw "personal responsibility" on any but the perpetrators of the crime which has been committed, and which must be dealt with according to law. The Orange lodges have no hesitation in throwing the responsibility on the Mayor of Montreal, and His Honour, I have little doubt, as well as many others, would throw it on the Orange societies. The Mayor is chiefly blamed by the Orangemen for not acceding to a request that he would afford protection to their procession at a time when it was contemplated, and when they seemed to have known that it would be interfered with. I did not believe that public opinion was against the Mayor with regard to his decision on that demand. There was, I own, great anxiety as to the consequences, and almost at the last moment a meeting of certain officers of societies was summoned, with a view to bring influence to bear against the contemplated procession. I own that, in my opinion, that meeting was a mistake, although I am persuaded that it was held with the best intentions. I have no doubt that the Roman Catholic gentlemen would have acted more wisely by abstaining from all interference in the matter. By taking part they were held to have incurred a responsibility for the conduct of their co-religionists, and have been actually charged with the violation of a pledge when they did all in their power to preserve order in the city. I admit that it is not an easy matter to persuade Orangemen to give up the ribands, the flags and the tunes, but if Protestants could not persuade them to do so, Catholics would have little chance. What I deplored during the anxious period which preceded the 12th was the apathy of the Protestant clergy of the city. I hoped that their influence might have been successfully used to prevent the celebration. As matters turned out, the final decision was arrived at too late. I doubt much whether it was generally known that the procession had been abandoned, for the crowd gathered at the Orange headquarters in St. James street evidently expecting the Orangemen to come from the same place as the previous year. I am satisfied that there was, and is, a general opinion that an efficient police force, such as could easily have been made available, would have preserved the peace. I am not uncharitable enough to impute bad motives, more especially when there is no ground for charging the Mayor with anything beyond an error in judgement. He was aware that there was to be no procession, and he probably never before had to deal with a 12th of July difficulty. However, there is no disputing the fact that had the police been on hand for three or four hours the crowd would have been dispersed without doing harm, and all the bitter feeling of the last fortnight would have been avoided. After the unfortunate event there was a general feeling that there ought to be no interference with the arrangements for the funeral. The Orangemen determined on making a demonstration that has excited feelings among the Roman Catholics that I earnestly hope will soon subside. I do not join in the condemnation of the TRUE WITNESS, because I believe that the editor of that paper has not much, if at all, exaggerated the feeling against Orangemen on the part of his countrymen. He does not pretend to express the opinions of Protestants, but those of his own race and religion, and if he has expressed them truly, surely it is better that we should know what they are. He has threatened the employment of physical force, but so have the Montreal Orangemen who have named 20,000 men as the contingent required. The game is one at which two can play, and the lovers of peace should condemn all these appeals, no matter from what party they proceed. I leave the subject now to be considered by those who alone can employ influences in the proper quarter, and I earnestly hope that the citizens of Montreal may not have to suffer the consequences of the Irish penal laws.

I am, yours truly,

F. HINKES.

ORANGISM CONDEMNED BY THE LONDON "TIMES"

The London *Times* in a leading article on the recent disturbances in Montreal, condemns the "bigotry" of the Orangemen as "reproducing in the full light of modern days the most discreditable episodes of the Ascendancy period of Irish history." It says that the Orangemen "have no more right to insult the Roman Catholics of Montreal than they would have to insult the Mussulmans in Stamboul, or the Hindoos in Benares." And "that they have less excuse because Orange intolerance had in Ireland an historical growth, while in Canada it is an imported plant, nurtured by a calculating bigotry and propagated by the labors of a misdirected zeal."