

The Irish Catholic

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. XXXIX.—NO. 2.

MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 15, 1888.

PRICE. — FIVE CENTS

CHAMBERLAIN ADMITS

Parnell's Disclaimers Regarding the Irish Leader's Hand in the Drafting of the Bill.

His Conferences with O'Shea Only—The United Leader Expresses Regret that the Present Controversy Between Himself and Parnell Should be Found Necessary.

LONDON, Aug. 13.—Mr. Chamberlain's reply to Mr. Parnell's recent letter is published this morning. Chamberlain says: Pressure of work prevented me replying to Mr. Parnell earlier and the difficulty in ascertaining what is now the issue between us. Previous to the appearance of his letter I understood that he denied that Mr. O'Shea had any authority to represent his views and that he repudiated all responsibility for the scheme of a national council and that what Mr. Parnell intended to repudiate was all cognizance or approval of what he calls my plan. This plan was really a suggestion contained in a short paragraph of a confidential letter addressed to an old personal acquaintance and since, with my permission, shown to a few gentlemen in Ireland. The idea was never worked out in detail or discussed with Mr. O'Shea. I am consequently quite ready to admit Mr. Parnell's disclaimer of any assent to it. Mr. Chamberlain proceeded to state that the scheme attributed to Mr. Parnell, appended to this letter, was the subject of conversation with Mr. O'Shea from the end of November, 1884.

It was brought to me in writing by Mr. O'Shea on January 18, 1885. Mr. Parnell's letters prove his authority, and also that Mr. O'Shea was a confidential exponent of his views at the time. These points, however, are not disputed in Mr. Parnell's letter to the *Times*. The correspondence also corroborates Mr. Parnell's statement that he did not intend the proposal as a substitute for an Irish parliament. Mr. Chamberlain says: I understood the proposal was offered as an acceptable settlement, though I felt that no statement made even by Mr. Parnell could bind the Irish people in future; and though I believed then, as now, a large and safe extension of local government was a subject which was fully discussed with my colleagues and was not finally rejected till May 9, 1885. When a new government was formed I tried to learn whether Mr. Parnell adhered to his proposal. In the middle of July Mr. O'Shea informed me that in view of the altered state of affairs in the north of Ireland he wished Mr. Parnell to doubt the policy of embarking the Irish question with a larger extension of local government to Ireland than to England. Upon this point I don't think there is any conflict in the testimony of myself and Mr. Parnell. The question of

THE RENEWAL OF THE CRIMES ACT was discussed simultaneously with the foregoing. In the spring of 1885 Mr. O'Shea brought Mr. Parnell's revised coercion act of 1882. I find on an inspection of the document that the following clauses remain as constituting the bill. Mr. Parnell had no serious objection to the then clauses 4 and 5. The first being altered by the transfer from clause one of the definition of offence, excluding, however treason and treason-felony. These are the special jury clauses: clause 6, change of venue; clause 13, alias clauses; clause 15 and 17, private inquisitions; clause 19 and 20 compensation for murder and injuries, to be levied on the district in which the offenses are committed; clause 24, omitting the first sub-section; clause 29 and 30, omitting the first three sub-sections; clause 31 and 33, with a consequential omission; clause 35 and 37, with an amendment limiting the duration of the act to one year.

Mr. Chamberlain says that in the course of subsequent conversations he told Mr. O'Shea he was of opinion that no Government could dispense with some provision against boycotting and intimidation. This point was much discussed. I understood that if the act was limited to a year Mr. Parnell would consent to more stringent provisions than if extended for three years. I therefore pressed this limitation strongly upon the other members of the Government. In conclusion I may say that neither at this time nor subsequently has it appeared to me that there was anything in these communications of which Mr. Parnell has cause to be ashamed. I believe that he has done so sincerely anxious to see the end of the agitation that had so long distracted Ireland. It was with this object that I understood him to propose a compromise between the views of the separatist party and the existing system, and I readily accepted the statement made to me of his attitude as entirely consistent with what I know of himself, especially with his offer to Mr. Gladstone at the Phoenix Park murders to retire from Parliament and abandon politics. I have always entertained the conviction that one of the most serious difficulties in the government of Ireland has been the isolation of the Gaelic and want of confidential interchange of opinion between the Parliament and the Government, and I must express my great regret that this difficulty has been rather increased than diminished by the experiment of myself and others, who have in recent years endeavored to overcome it.

PARNELL'S PROPOSAL FOR HOME RULE.

LONDON, August 14.—The proposal of Mr. Parnell for the settlement of the Irish question, which Mr. Chamberlain refers to in his letter to the *Times* as having been brought to him by Mr. O'Shea in 1885, and which is appended to his letter, is headed "Local Self-Government in Ireland." The plan is to elect a board of three county boards to be elected by the ratepayers triennially by ballot. The boards would levy county rates, would be sanitary authorities, and would administer all county business, the relief of the poor in infirmaries, hospitals and asylums, and attend to roads, bridges and harbors. The boards would have power to compulsorily purchase or lease land for all these objects, as well as for the erection of churches, schools, laborers' cottages, etc.; to grant concessions for and to provide county and boroughal subvention and guarantees of interest to railways, tramways and other public undertakings within the county; to order or undertake such subsidiary schemes of arterial drainage as may be confined to their areas of jurisdiction and to delegate their powers to committees. A board would, moreover, be authorized to associate itself with one or more boards for business of the nature disclosed which might overlap its boundary. In order to guard the rights of land owners a

representation in proportion to the rates paid by them ought to be admitted to the Board. Generally speaking, the landlord pays half the poor rates, and the tenant half the poor rates and the whole of the county cess now. According to the nature of the local taxation of Ireland, just presented to parliament, it appears the amounts levied on real property outside of the towns were, for poor rates £1,147,322, and for county cess £1,191,920. Supposing, therefore, that the land owners were bound to bear one-fourth of these burdens, they might be allowed a one-fourth representation on county boards. To make sure of the system of separate elections for the two classes might be established. It would perhaps be found convenient to levy a single county rate for all purposes, such rate to be equitably divided between landlord and tenant, according to the present average in proportion to their respective ratings. County boards and municipalities would elect representatives, according to population, to serve on a central in Dublin for the purpose of these elections. The representatives of the land owners would have a separate selective power proportionate to that of their constituencies in elections to the county boards.

THE CATHOLIC PRESS.

Rev. Father O'Malley, S.J., Goulbourn, Australia, recently preached a sermon in which he took occasion to make these sterling observations: "If Catholics heard their religion constantly enervated, and had no paper to defend them, they would grow ashamed of it. If they heard Ireland constantly slandered, they would feel ashamed of the being known that they were the descendants of Irishmen. Yet how did Irishmen deal with their Irish Catholic papers? He did not believe they had a single Irish Catholic daily paper in the world, because they would not support it! If they took a Protestant paper, or an infidel paper that abused their country and belied six days in the week, they would pay punctually on the day the account was due; but if there was question of a poor Catholic paper that was fighting for them, they would let it starve. How often had the proprietors to lose heavy amounts in paper and postage! and how often did they lose all. It was a duty to their children to furnish them with good Irish Catholic papers, and not to pay for them as positive dishonesty. In the next life they would have to pay 'the very last farthing.' Father O'Malley concluded by an earnest appeal to his hearers to support the Catholic press.—*The Monitor*.

THE SCAPULAR.

The scapular must be worn suspended, one piece on the breast the other over the shoulder. Must also be worn day and night, in sickness and in health, and at the hour of death. It is wrong to hang it up at night, or to lay it aside even for a day. You forfeit the indulgences. You must be invested with the (first) Scapular by a priest. You are thereby admitted into the order of Mount Carmel. If the Scapular wears out the new one need not be blessed, for in the first all the rest are blessed. Burn up the old one and put on a new one. You are not bound to recite any special prayers to gain the indulgences of the Scapular. By devotion and habitually wearing it you will gain this promise of the Virgin Mary, namely, that "He who dies invested with this shall never suffer in the fire of hell."

CHRIST TO THE UNFAITHFUL SOUL.

The following is a free translation of the famous lines traced on the walls of the Cathedral of Liebeck:

Thou callest Me Master—and heedest not Me;
Thou callest Me Light—and I shine not for Thee;
Thou callest Me the way—and dost follow Me not;
Thou callest Me the Life—and My name is forgotten;
Thou callest Me the Truth—and defilest thy soul;
Thou callest Me Guide—and despisest control;
Thou callest Me Lovely—withholding thy heart;
Thou callest Me Rich—and desirest no part;
Thou callest Me Eternal—nor seekest My Truth;
Thou callest Me Merciful—massing thy prayers;
Thou callest Me Noble—and draggest Me down;
Thou callest Me Almighty—nor fearest My frown.
Thou callest Me Just—eh, it just then I be,
When I shall condemn thee, reproach thou not Me.

THE DAILY MASS.

Judging from the small number present at the holy sacrifice of the Mass during the week, it seems that Catholics do not fully understand what the sacrifice of the Mass is. No doubt the most indifferent Christian would esteem it the greatest of blessings to have been present on Calvary's Mount when Christ was both Victim and Priest. But does he not realize that the same sacrifice is offered up on every altar, in every Christian land, every hour of the day? "From the setting of the sun," the clean obligation is made. True, there are few churches in which the people can be numbered by more than tens at the daily mass. And the pastors of these churches have the most temporal success as well as spiritual. Show us a congregation in which there are a large number of weekly communicants, and a large number who hear the daily mass, and we will show you a congregation in which the members do not have to be forced to pay their rent or other dues. Three things will insure temporal as well as spiritual success: the frequentation of the sacraments, the daily mass, and a Catholic paper. If pastors would encourage their flock to take some Catholic paper, their minds would not only receive good food, but the evil of the daily papers would be counteracted. In every city there is at least one Catholic paper, which not only gives the Church news of the diocese, but matter that is interesting to each congregation. And what is still of more importance, there will always be something instructive, and which will tend to lift them above this work-day world to thoughts of eternity. A Catholic paper is good for soul as well as mind, and those heads of families who do not take one are neglecting a great opportunity of good for their children.—*Catholic Telegraph*.

Glowing accounts continue to be received from Brazil of the favorable working of the recent edict of emancipation. No disturbance has accompanied the adoption of the measure for the abolition of slavery, and peace reigns unquestioned throughout Dom Pedro's progressive empire. This intelligence must give pleasure to every man who desires the establishment of true freedom.

WHY CHILDREN SHOW A DISASTE FOR RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION.

What! Children do not like to listen to religious instruction which is, Chamberlain says, the grandest, the most beautiful and the most interesting of all sciences. God forgives the teacher for he alone is in fault! The religious instructions of Our Lord were so filled with wonders, and interest, and his powers and beauty of illustration so grand and attractive, and yet so clear and simple that the people followed him in thousands into the desert as from city to city without thinking of sleeping or eating. Many of his followers, such as St. Vincent Ferrer, St. Francis Xavier, St. Francis of Sales, and others gave their instructions in so attractive a manner that the people crowded around them in thousands, hanging on with breathless attention to every word they said. In the "Life of Cardinal Cheverus" we read that his explanations of the catechism, chapter after chapter, were so charmingly attractive, that the great, learned and rich crowded around him from every direction. It is hardly necessary to add here that the secret of a catechist's success lies more in the preparation he makes than in the manner he uses. "God helps him who helps himself." Teachers who put their classes without preparation can expect nothing but trouble. He who is thoroughly prepared goes to his class joyfully and with confidence. Knowing and feeling that he is master of what he has to teach, he gives his lessons and explanations with order, clearness, taste and life, and his pupils, who listen attentively to instructions that are so clear, plain and interesting. The true catechist will follow the example of our Lord by making frequent use of similitudes, parables and edifying histories.

Floury, a distinguished writer of the Church, says: "Children instructed in a cold, lifeless manner care with them during their lives a secret hatred for those instructors that so wearied and tortured them in childhood. All discourses on religion seem to them dull and tiresome. If they hear sermons, or read books of piety, it is with disgust as men take medicines that are wholesome, but disagreeable. These are the instructions that make libertines and drive children from the sacraments and from the Church. Behold how terrible may be the effects of instructions given in a cold, careless, indifferent manner."

"It is hard to understand," says another eminent writer, "how anybody with the full use of his senses can spout away, for an hour—even at the top of his voice—for a crowd of children, without noticing in their dreamy eyes, and restless movements, their agonizing looks, and their wandering glances in every direction, that they are paying no attention and are learning nothing but to hate religion."

"Children," said Dupanloup, "may know every word of the catechism, and still be ignorant of their religion; may approach the sacraments month after month without knowing what they are doing, and may be ignorant of even the truths necessary for salvation."

The "Pastor and People," a very excellent work, says: "Children leaving school and going into the world among infidels and bad Catholics, armed with no knowledge of their religion and with the memory of the dry, unexplained words of their catechism, are nearly sure to neglect their religion," and Lambing, Hamond, Judd, St. Liguori and others say in substance that the mere memorizing of the words of the catechism parrot-like, without a proper explanation of its meaning will avail nothing.

WOMEN AS WAGE-EARNERS.

The following paragraph is taken from an article on this subject in a recent number of the *Popular Science Monthly*. It presents forcibly a very important phase of the wage question.

For years the world has been on a moral crusade against the employment of children in mines and factories, while the far greater evils that result from the mothers going out as wage earners have attracted comparatively little attention. Labor, with certain limits, is good for the child, giving it a wholesome moral discipline, and training it for the business by which it is to earn its livelihood; but when a married woman leaves her home and enters the world, she takes upon her shoulders a heavy burden of responsibilities that properly belong to the other sex, it is time for humanity to protest in the name of her offspring.

"No one individual can fulfil satisfactorily the double role, I should say, the triple function of bearing and rearing children, and providing for their maintenance. A man laboring woman herself, and have met with some success as a bread-winner; and I know that the conditions of performing this function satisfactorily are quite incompatible with those arduous and important duties which make such heavy demands upon every conscientious mother, especially among the poor."

"In the homes of the very poor there are no hired servants to keep the household machinery running smoothly while the mistress is away. The wife of the laboring man is frequently cook, nurse, housemaid, laundress, all in one; and if she must go out as a bread-winner besides, what is to prevent the domestic engine from running off the track and getting itself hopelessly clogged?"

The writer says it is true, and true also for reasons additional to those which she (for the writer is a woman) has mentioned. The efforts of a woman to support a family by daily work in factories as a "wage-earner" is not only grievous injustice to herself by imposing on her greater burdens than she can bear, but is an injustice to her children, and not only to them, but to her husband also.

A husband's first and highest duty, next to God, is to his wife and to the children she brings forth, and a wife's first and highest duty, next to God, is to her husband and the children he has begotten.

The husband, by the law of nature, which is simply unwritten divine, is the bread-winner, and by the same law the wife is the housewife, the regulator of the home. Upon her rests in highest degree (her husband providing the means) the duty to make the home pleasant and quiet, restful, enjoyable and salutary to husband and children.

But how can a woman who has to leave her home and spend the whole day earning a livelihood, and who has to do so in a factory, or at least without discharging only in part, the duties she owes, not only to her children, but also to her husband?

We know full well, while writing this, that thousands and hundreds of thousands of wives and mothers are compelled to struggle under this triple burden, and that they do so bravely and uncomplainingly. But it is not less gross an injustice to them, to their husbands and their children.

It may be said, and truly, that the present industrial structure of society requires this. But this does not diminish at all the force of what we have said. It simply proves the wrong that exists in the present condition of wage-earners.—*Catholic Standard*.

KNOWLEDGE AND PIETY.

THEIR INTIMATE RELATIONS AND ENTIRE HARMONY

Experience has testified again and again that learning is no bestower of virtue, and that between the one and the other there is no necessary connection. Learning will neither make a knave honest, nor a drunkard sober. Rather the reverse. If a man will be a villain, a more cunning, a more subtle, and, therefore, more successful villain. As the uplifted arm of an assassin is not stayed by sharpening his murderous blade, neither is a villain by sharpening his depraved wit. If he were before a thief he will now become a more daring and a more skillful one. He will do his work on a larger scale. Instead of breaking into houses after nightfall, or stopping the traveller on his lonely way, he will force his way into the sanctuaries of the law, and in a word, hold the more exalted positions in his nefarious profession.

If from persons we turn to places the same truth is forced upon us. Whether are persons on an average better educated in town or country? Unquestionably in towns. Yet crimes of all kinds are far more prevalent among the inhabitants of large populations than elsewhere. Cities are the best educated, yet criminally the worst. It has been pointed out more than once that a general and rapid rise in popular and secular education is followed almost invariably by a rise in crime. There is no essential connection between knowledge and virtue; the one is no necessary concomitant of the other, and great mental strength and moral weakness may both be tenants of the same soul.

What then are we to conclude? Shall we say that secular knowledge is antagonistic to virtue? No, but that it is distinct from it and independent of it, and the sanctity may shine forth fair and bright without its aid. Jesus Christ, the only true physician of this sickly sin-stricken world, has prescribed many means by which it might be restored to a healthier state. Prayer, the sacraments, fasting, alms-deeds, meditation, penance, are all mentioned, but nowhere does He mention mere secular education. And although He Himself in the Infinite Wisdom of God, we never read that He ever attempted to enforce His doctrines by any display of worldly learning or profound erudition; on the other hand it is quite certain that the boasted wisdom of the Pharisees, Scribes, and Doctors of the Law did not render them one whit more amenable to His

teaching, nor in any way render to accept His doctrine than the poor, the ignorant, and the unlettered, but just the reverse.

"Then do Catholics reject wisdom and make light of knowledge?" will ask the scolding infidel. Do Catholics despise the learned and the sacred writings of the Church of God as an advocate of ignorance? Far from it. As the sun by its very nature is the chief source of light as well as heat, so is the Church by its very constitution the chief centre of learning as well as of piety. Her track through the centuries is an imperishable evidence of the fact. She cannot show herself in any country or in any age without imparting light, which is knowledge, and heat, which is love.

Any unbiased thinker who has turned over the pages of his history, or whose mind is however slightly tinged with a knowledge of the past, will be compelled to admit that she has ever been the guardian of knowledge and promoter of science. Some have even so consistently encouraged philosophy, history, literature and science as the popes and bishops of the Church, and even Protestants are loud in their testimony to the fact, that it was due to the care and labors of monks that we have the valuable remains of antiquity so well, sacred and profane. The profoundest minds and the keenest intellects the world has ever known, have developed within her fold and expanded under her benign influence. Names might be quoted, passages might be cited, and references might be given were we writing a volume and not a mere sketch. Let it suffice to say that the Church has never fostered learning, but she has patronized the arts, though she has not over so far forgotten her mission as to confuse knowledge with piety. She has cherished it as she cherishes every other natural gift of God, but she has never put it on a level with the supernatural. She loves learning, but her love is not blind. She loves it sincerely, but not when fostered by supernatural charity. Those among her children, especially noted for their learning, she even honors with the title of Doctors of the Universal Church.

POPULAR SCIENCE NOTES.

PRODUCING ELECTRICITY BY WIND POWER.—Professor Blyth recently read an interesting paper dealing with the production of electricity by wind power before the Glasgow Philosophical Society. During last summer Professor Blyth had an opportunity of making a practical experiment. He erected a small windmill for supplying electric light by means of storage cells to a small cottage in the village of Marykirk, where he spent his summer holiday. The windmill was of the old English type, and was erected in the garden. The dynamo was driven directly from the axle-wheel by means of a rope, and a workable speed was obtained even when the windmill moved at a comparatively slow speed. The current from the dynamo was employed to charge twelve electric power storage cells, which supplied ten eight-candle incandescent lamps in the cottage.

HOW TO ESTIMATE BRICK WORK.—Ordinary bricks are about 8 inches in length, and with a mortar joint about that in width, so that each brick on the flat will give a horizontal surface of about 62 square inches, or 4 1/2 bricks will cover a square foot. As ordinarily laid there are nine courses to every 24 inches, or 4 1/2 bricks to the square gives 20 1/2 bricks to the cubic foot. Waste, pointing and closer joints will easily require an allowance of 21 bricks per cubic foot, which

will be found a very convenient figure for estimating the number of bricks required for a wall of a given size and thickness, as it thus becomes unnecessary to find the cubic contents of the wall, but merely to multiply its face area or the product of its length and height in feet by seven-fourths of its thickness in inches, which, as the thickness is always some multiple of 4 inches, is a very simple process.—*Sanitary Engineer*.

THE ELECTRICAL MESSENGER BOY.—The chief secret of the rapid advance of electricity as a motor is found in the flexibility of its resources. Electricity is not the generator of power, but only the agency for its transmission and distribution, as it is an agent for the transmission of the human voice over the telephone wire. Through its resources power can be distributed to any point, and in quantities to suit the customer. Steam, water, air, caloric, or any known agency for generating power, is either stationary, or it demands stationary appliances; but electricity is its messenger boy, its "Puck," who will consent to do its errands invisibly and never take a day off or the grant of liberty. Does a lady want an infinitesimal bit of electrical energy to relieve her foot on the treadle of her sewing machine? It can be delivered in her room through an iron box not much bigger than her reticule. The restaurant-keeper plagued by an invasion of flies that expel all but the most hungry and least respectable customers. They can be gently wafted to the door by a multitude of revolving fans and coned out either in the bright sunlight or refreshing shower. Everywhere, anywhere, without a particle of dust, offensive odor or disagreeable noise, the electric motor can be set to work and it will bring the substance of the thing wanted to it, without being ever seen, and can give offence. The electric motor has passed its experimental stages and the day seems to be rapidly approaching when every horse will find something for it to do in lifting burdens from floor to floor, and performing every possible labor that can be done by machinery. Manufacturers have not yet begun to construct motors ornamented with gold leaf, mother of pearl, and precious stones to rock cradles in the nurseries, but these requirements will come in time.

THE IRISHMAN IN POLITICS.

His Capacity for Self-Government is of a Superior Order.

It is asked: Has the Irishman the same capacity for self-government as the citizen of an American State? Many Englishmen seem inclined to answer the question negatively, and to regard this answer as a fatal bar to Home Rule. But an American of 1888 can scarcely understand you asking this question. He has constantly before his eyes the strongest proof of the Irish aptitude for political discussion. Nothing, he would assure you, from his own experience, suits the constant exercise of the faculties which are best adapted for local politics. A political sphere suits the Irishman's versatile genius, and employs his "gift of the gab." What your Irish man wants most of all is some outlet for his political steam, and this he finds in the profusion of the small details of local government.

Strange as it may seem, this race, which is at present denied Home Rule at home, actually controls, partly by its power of numbers, but still more by dint of its capacity for political debate and by electoral organization, the government of most of the American cities from New York to San Francisco. At this moment the moving experiment of Irish Home Rule is visible across the ocean under the most free and democratic of all governments. New York is said to be the largest Irish city in the world. Even learned and elegant Boston has its Irish Roman Catholic mayor. The first daily newspaper which appeared in America, the *Penny Press*, was published by an Irishman, and from that day to this the Irish have exercised enormous influence through the American press. As senators, representative State governors, mayors they have taken their full share in carrying on the government of the Republic. It would be superfluous to multiply instances in every department of life in which Irishmen in America have come to the front rank. The important part which the Irish vote has played in the presidential election of the time of Andrew Jackson, the first Irish president, till to-day is known to all. And looking in a general way to the quality of the Irish immigrants, almost any fair-minded American would tell you that the Irish compare favorably at the present moment with the immigrants from other countries, with regard to their fitness for being entrusted with the political rights which America gives to her citizens. If not immediately upon landing at Castle Garden, as an effect of the ocean, at all events in a generation, the wild Kerry immigrant is transformed into the most law-abiding citizen in the world. From the statistics of the last census (1880) in America, it appears that the total number of citizens of the United States who were born in Ireland is 1,850,571, as against 745,978 born in Great Britain and 1,996,742 born in Germany. But while Germany only contributes 4,469 German-born persons to the staff of officials of the civil service of the Government, and Great Britain 8,039, Ireland is represented by 8,281 Irish-born persons in the civil service of the State. Statistics of other occupations in the voluminous reports of the last census are equally striking. Samuel Lover wrote of the Irish peasant, that "his enemies representing him as a fend of means his friends to paint him as a saint." The truth is that the Irishman at home is a failure, and abroad, speaking generally, a success, an indication, one would say, that his crimes at home are the results of political circumstances peculiar to Ireland.

It has always seemed to us that a strong argument exists for Mr. Gladstone's original proposal to allow Ireland, if she so wills it, when Home Rule is given her, to remain unrepresented in the Imperial Parliament for a time. Ireland will have enough to do, and more than enough, to set her own house in order to begin with. She is not keenly interested in Imperial matters at this juncture. She might well afford to take time to settle her proper relations to the Imperial Government.

We do not mean to contend that the American cities are always model communities. They are too well known, after scandals like the recent disgraceful disclosures in New York, to be occasionally the scenes of jobbery and municipal corruption. But, in the first place, it is certain that the municipal constitutions of the American cities are often to blame for their bad government, and that these will in time right themselves. And, secondly, particular attention is due to the fact that American cities are not noted for any acts of tyranny of the many

over the few, such as we are told to anticipate from Home Rule in Ireland; but, on the contrary, their losses from bad government are usually a dishonest transfer from the many into the pockets of the few.—*London Westminster Review*.

TRYING TO FORCE A VOTE.

The Republicans Filled in an Effort to Get a Division on the Fisheries Treaty—Fish Monopolists Denounced—A Blushing Rebuke for Carnegie.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 13.—The Senate resumed consideration of the fisheries treaty to-day, and was addressed by Mr. Call in support of its ratification. He argued that the contention of Mr. Sherman that the great bays on the Canadian coast were high seas and that the property would apply to the open sea fishery of Florida between Key West and the mainland and to the coasts of Alaska and the Northwest, and would amount to a surrender of territorial possession and jurisdiction over all that vast line. To his mind a treaty, which asserted the jurisdictional power and the right over these waters, was to be commended as establishing a principle more important than the enjoyment of the inshore fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence. He said that the United States was great and powerful, but only so long and so far as it conformed to right, to justice, to humanity in its relations with other nations. He declared he would not be willing to grant commercial rights in Florida waters to foreign fishing smacks and he was not willing that Canada should be retaliated against for taking that position. The effect of retaliation proposed was to make people in the United States pay two prices for the fish they used. He regarded the pending treaty as fair and just and proper.

The presiding officer (Mr. Cockrell) announced the question to be on Mr. Morgan's motion to postpone the consideration of the treaty till December next and asked if the Senate was ready for the question.

Mr. Hoar.—On that motion I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. Gray said that before the vote was taken he desired to say something on the motion. It had become evident on the Republican side of the chamber that the treaty was not to be ratified at this session. The Senate had been told in a more or less emphatic tone that it was not only to be rejected, but was to be rejected to-day. The treaty was being discussed in the very midst of an excited political campaign, and Democratic Senators had been told they were arguing the British side of the case. Why should consideration of the treaty be postponed? Why should not those influences that come from the other side of thought and from the absence of extraneous influences and excitement be involved? The issues involved were momentous, and the consequences that might arise were too grave to be lightly dealt with. The fishermen, whose rights were the subject matter of the treaty, were pursuing their avocations now unmolested, under the protocol attached to the treaty. The burden was on those who desired that the postponement should be made to give some good strong and broad reason for their opposition. Mr. Gray then proceeded to criticize a published letter purporting to be from Mr. C. L. Woodbury which stated that the 12th article of the treaty gave away the rights of the States to control their territorial waters. He declared this was an absolutely fatuous argument; that it was unwarrantable and nonsensical. He did not believe that Mr. Woodbury had ever risked his high professional reputation by such an argument. He asserted that the claim of Canada over its bays was as absolute as the claim of Maryland to jurisdiction over Chesapeake Bay. These waters were as much a part of the local jurisdiction as the solid ground covered by our fields and houses. The pending treaty came to the Senate ear marked with justice and magnanimity which should belong to a great people. It surrendered nothing and asked nothing which a proud and free people should not ask.

Mr. Beck inferred incidentally to the duty on Bessemer steel, by which, he said, "Mr. Carnegie had been given a bonus of \$1,500,000 so that he could carry in his carriage throughout Scotland the Warwick of the Republican party, who had now come back to this country to belittle all the rest of the Republicans."

Mr. Gray again resuming complimented Mr. Sherman on the statesmanlike exordium of his recent speech, but said that when he got down from the plane of statesmanship to that of partisanship he floundered. On concluding Mr. Gray said that if the treaty should be rejected and the annoyances to American fishermen should be renewed the responsibility would fall on those who voted to reject the treaty.

Mr. George read from the Boston *Herald* the report of a meeting of the "Deep Sea Assembly K. of L." held at Gloucester, at which resolutions were passed protesting against the fish trust and favoring competition as the only remedy. He asked Mr. Hoar if the *Herald* report of the meeting might be relied upon.

Mr. Hoar said that there were a great many things in that paper that would very much mislead anybody, but it would not publish a narrative of facts which it did not believe to be entirely true. Continuing he said that the picture which the assemblage of Gloucester Knights of L. had drawn of the fisheries and the fishing interests and of the laboring men and capitalists of Massachusetts was a slander and devoid of truth. Mr. Hoar then made some pointed allusions to Senator George, and the latter rose to reply, but on motion of Mr. Beck the Senate at 6.15 adjourned.

The power of fortune is conferred only by the miserable; the happy impute all their success to prudence or merit.—Swift.

The best we do is often that for which our age and our friends care the least.