The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY

The True Witness Printing & Publishing Co.

(LIMITED)

253 St. James Street, Montreal, Canada.

P. O. Box 1138.

MS. and all other communications intended for publication or notice, should be addressed to the Editor, and all business and other communications to the Managing Director, TRUE WITNESS P. & P. Co., Ltd., P. O. Box 1138.

The Subscription price of THE TRUE WITNESS for city, Great Britain, Ireland and France, is $1.50.

Belgium, Italy, Germany and Australia, $2.00. Canada, United States and Newfoundland, $1.00. Terms payable in advance.

New subscriptions can commence at any time during the year.

Money for renewal and new subscriptions should be sent to Managing Director, P. O. Box 1138.

You may remit by bank cheque, post office money order, express money order or by registered letter. Silver sent through the mail is liable to wear a hole through the envelope and be lost.

We are not responsible for money lost through the mail.

Discontinuance.—Remember that the publishers must be notified by letter when a subscriber wishes his paper stopped. All arrearages must be paid.

Returning your paper will not enable us to discontinue it, as we cannot find your name on our books unless your post office address is given.

The date opposite your name on the margin of your paper shows you up to what time your subscription is paid.

We recognize the friends of THE TRUE WITNESS by the prompt manner in which they pay their subscriptions.

Always give the name of the post office to which your paper is sent. Your name cannot be found on our books unless this is done.

When you wish your address changed, write us in time, giving your old address as well as your new one.

If you fail to receive your paper regularly, notify us at once by letter or postal.

All communications for publication must be written on one side of the sheet only, otherwise they are liable to rejection.

WEDNESDAY,..................JULY 1, 1896

SOME IMPORTANT ISSUES.

John Stuart Mill, who, some fifty years ago, was regarded as the apostle of free trade, on the straight lines of the British free trader, made concessions to the principle of protection which seem especially adapted to a country like ours, with an older, stronger and successful manufacturing rival alongside of it. Though often quoted, the following passage will bear repetition at the present stage in our economic history:

"The superiority of one country over another in a branch of production often arises only from having begun it sooner. There may be no inherent advantage on one part, or disadvantage on the other, but only a present superiority of acquired skill and experience. A country which has this skill and experience yet to acquire may in other respects be better adapted to the production than those which were earlier in the field; and, besides, it is a just remark that nothing has a greater tendency to promote improvements in any branch of production than its trial under a new set of conditions. But it cannot be expected that individuals should at their own risk, or rather at their certain loss, introduce a new manufacture and bear the burden of carrying it on, until the producers have been educated up to the level of those with whom the processes are traditional. A protecting duty continued for a reasonable time will sometimes be the least inconvenient method in which a nation can tax itself for the support of such an experiment. But the protection should be confined to cases in which there is good ground for assurance that the industry which it fosters will after a time be able to dispense with it; nor should the domestic producers ever be allowed to expect that it will be continued to them, beyond the time strictly necessary for a fair trial of what they are capable of accomplishing."

The last sentence acquires some significance from certain remarks that Mr. Mill had already made regarding the economic policy of the United States. He speaks of the United States as one of the countries in which the system of protection is declining, but not yet wholly given up. Now, more than fifty years after Mr. Mill wrote thus of protection in the United States, the sad results of the experiments of a revolutionary tariff has convinced the majority of the people that to give up protection is simply to disorganize the bulk of American industries and to doom hundreds of thousands of families to the risk of empty handedness and starvation. With such a warning before him, no statesman of common humanity, not to speak of patriotism, would venture to interfere with a system to which the country mainly owes its prosperity. It is satisfactory to learn that Mr. Laurier has no intention of revolutionizing our protective tariff, but simply contemplates reforming it. Nor will he introduce his reforms without due deliberation and without consulting these interested, so that in encouraging trade and cheapening the necessaries of life he will take care not to cheapen wages or to destroy the enterprises, in the maintenance of which not only fair wages, but for many classes of workers the chance of gaining any livelihood at all, may be said to depend. Mr. Laurier is not a mere theorist like John Stuart Mill. If some international tribunal of universally recognized authority wished that trade must be everywhere and always free, then the logic of the freetrader would be of universal application, and theory and practice would coincide. But there is no such tribunal, and the exercise of national free will antagonizes international free trade. Even the most wealthy and independent of nations cannot practice comprehensive free trade without some disadvantage. The nation which is the free-trader's great example of the possibility of a free trade that pays in spite of all encompassing protection, could not stand the rivalry for any length of time, if it had not first of all grown rich on a protection that baulked at nothing. It is now, moreover, beginning to be felt that such a defiance of the outside protected world cannot endure for ever, however strong the bulwark of wealth with which it started. Nor, in any case, has such an experiment, though its triumph embraced every interest concerned (which it does not), any pertinency to a young country like Canada, which, notwithstanding seemingly boundless resources, has no stay in acquired wealth, and is exposed to a ruinous competition from a powerful protected neighbor.

We look on this economic question as too essentially linked with the industrial life of the country to be kept up as a party cry. That it ever should have been deemed necessary to so regard it is a misfortune for us as it has proved calamitous in the United States. Surely one may call himself a Reformer or a Liberal and honestly believe that there is ample scope for his energies as such, while still holding economic views that lean to protection rather than free trade. On the other hand, Canadian, like British, Conservatives might see opportunities for the exercise of wise caution, while recognizing the need of a broad constructive statesmanship, and at the same time clinging to the principle of free trade. Such exceptions there are not only in the electorate but among the representatives of the people. We deal with the question from the standpoint of this fact, and impressed with the importance of a subject of such far-reaching interest and to some of vital consequence. Their course, moreover, is justified by the utterances of the successful leader and the pledges of several of his followers. Party is doubtless a necessity under our system of parliamentary government, but the best judgments on questions that affect the people at large are formed by those who accustom themselves to take independent and practical views, who concede to others the same right and who credit even those who differ from them with honesty of intention and that devotion to their country's weal by which they profess to be actuated themselves. Those who ever prone to impute evil ambition, darkness of mind and lack of patriotism to opponents, can hardly complain when they find others judging them by the same false standard. And unhappily too much of our party criticism and discussion is conducted on the lines we condemn. But the golden rule is of universal application.

THE "NATION."

The first number of the revived Dublin Nation has reached us, and we give it a cordial welcome, in the hope at the same time that it may prove not unworthy of the glorious past. At the present moment a great deal depends upon the press of Ireland, it can either make or mar the future of the country. Those who are in the thick of the fight may not realize how great is their responsibility. Men are needed, with minds broad enough, and hearts animated with sufficient patriotism, to sink all personal considerations, stamp out all jealousies and look but to one thing, the triumph of the sacred cause of Ireland. The Nation can be a powerful helper in the good work. If there be men in the ranks of Ireland's friends who cannot co-operate with others, then, in the name of the best interests of our fatherland, let them disappear from the scene for some time, and leave the settlement of the Irish question to those who are ready to join hands, who are ready to bury the past and obliterate all remembrance of dissensions, in a generous effort for the achievement of Home Rule.

OF the 29,000,000 inhabitants of England and Wales at the last census, 20,800,000, or over two-thirds, live in towns and cities and only 8,200,000 in the country. In Scotland one-half of the population lived in towns of more than 10,000 inhabitants, though in Ireland the proportion was about one in six.

AT the regular meeting of the Irish National Federation on June 3d, at which Mr. John Dillon, M.P., was the principal speaker, Detective Jeremiah Springer, from the head office in the lower Castle Yard, was present, and took notes of all the speeches. The Tory coercionists at the Castle must be seeking for fresh material to use against the National movement.

A REGENT OF FRANCE.

The death of the Duc de Nemours will recall to French Royalists one of the most eventful periods in the reign of King Louis Philippe. Nearly fifty-four years ago, under circumstances of peculiar and wide-spread sorrow, the prince who has just passed away was appointed Regent of France. The King had been twelve years on the throne when the whole royal family was plunged into the deepest affliction by the death of the Duke of Orleans through an accident. His Royal Highness had been thrown out of his carriage and received such injuries that he breathed his last in a few hours. The heir to the throne had married a princess of the House of Mecklinberg Schwerin, and left two sons, Philippe, Comte de Paris, then in his fourth year, and the Duc de Chartres, a child of twenty months. Apart from the sympathy that was generally felt for the royal household in such a bereavement, reasons of state gave an unusual importance to the fatality. His Majesty was in his 70th year, and even those statesmen who believed that the house of Orleans had an assured future in France, naturally looked with misgiving on the prospect of a long minority, in case of the King's demise. It was determined to lose no time in creating a Regent, who should be ready, in such a contingency, to assume the responsibilities of sovereignty. The ordinary course under the old monarchy was to nominate the mother of the heir presumptive to that dignity, but a bill was passed conferring the honor on the Duc de Nemours, who thus became a person of European consequence. Already the Regent had been offered two crowns—that of Belgium, finally accepted by the widower of the Princess Charlotte, whose death prepared the way for the as yet unborn Princess of Victoria to the throne of Great Britain; and that of Greece, first worn by Otho of Bavaria, and from him transferred to George of Denmark. Through his marriage with a daughter of the house of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha, the Duc de Nemours was brought into relations of affinity with the late Prince Consort of England. His eldest son, brought up in exile, after the Revolution of 1848, married the heiress apparent to the throne of Brazil, the daughter of the good Dom Pedro, whom some of our readers may remember having seen in Montreal, when he deemed his throne secure. Although at the time of the late Duke's appointment as Regent the day of doom for the citizen King was within measurable distance to the eye of a clear sighted prophet, so little aprehension was felt at what proved to be real signs of danger that Louis Phillippe and his ministers joined heartily in the honors to the dead Emperor, while the despised nephew of his uncle heard in his captivity the sounds of joy that foretokened his own triumph in a not distant day. The restoration of Napoleon's remains was meant to be Britain's grand act of reconciliation and it was hoped that France and England would bury their ancient feuds in the Emperor's new tomb. Had the Orleanists been wise they would have recalled the poet's line, "Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes," for, by reviving the Napoleonic spirit, it proved fatal to their dynasty.

But, although Louis Philippe died dethroned and in exile, his line was not extinguished as a ruling house. It was the policy of his ministers to strengthen France and the Orleanist cause by alliances with neighboring Sovereignties—a policy that gave much offence at the Court of St. James's. The late King of Spain married his grand-daughter. The King of the Belgians is his grandson. Another of his descendants is the Prince Ferdinand of Bulgaria, and but for De Fonseca's *coup d'etat* his blood would have been recognized on the throne of Brazil. Though the head of the house is discrowned, his heirship, since the death of the Comte de Chambord without issue, is all that the most exacting legitimists could demand. Nevertheless, there was an attempt, after the death of the Comte de Paris, to seek a chief among the Spanish Bourbons. There was something pathetic in the position of the two young princes orphaned by a casuality while their father, whose succession then seemed fairly sure, was in the vigor of his manhood, and driven from their native land by the people who had seemed devoted to their cause only to see a rival dynasty successfully claim their rights. Their espousal of the cause of the North in the American civil war might seem to have had a precedent in the early Italian career of Louis Napoleon and his brother, though some may say that there was precedent enough in their own family. There were those, indeed, who saw a just retribution in the misfortunes that overtook Louis Philippe and his descendants and especially in the exclusion of the latter from the French throne. The reconciliation with the Comte de Chambord, in many ways a striking contrast to his successor, was not at first acceptable to all the legitimists, but gradually most of the dissidents fell into line. The gravest mistake of the Comte de Paris and his advisers was their adoption of the Boulanger movement. Even when allowance was made for reasonable resentment at the treatment which the Republic had thought fit to show to the Princes in 1886, the courted alliance with the "brave general" was unworthy of the high principles with which he had previously been credited. Neither did the reputation of the Duke of Orleans gain anything by his sensational defiance of the Republican authorities. The contemptuous lenity with which his offence was visited tended to make him ridiculous in the eyes of the world and robbed him of any prestige of martyrdom that his escapade might have won for him had it been severely dealt with.

The visit to this country of the Prince de Joinville revived the interest of French Canadians in the Orleanist branch of the old royal house by which the colony had been founded. But the occasion was surpassed by the arrival amongst us of the Comte de Paris and the Duc d' Orleans some seven years ago. They were welcomed not as the representatives of the younger branch merely, but as the heirs of Henry the Fourth, Louis the Thirteenth and the *grand monarche*. The protest against the formal reception with which they were honored was confined to a few and everything passed off most satisfactorily. The Comte de Paris cordially acknowledged the advantages which the descendants of the subjects of his ancestors enjoyed as citizens of the British Empire and subjects of Queen Victoria. That France will ever again recognize the sway of a Bourbon King does not at this moment seem very probable. Nevertheless it would be rash to indulge in predictions regarding a people who have undergone so many changes in a little over a century. To Irish students of history the old French monarchy must ever have a romantic history, for in the service of France, for generations following the English Revolution and the fall of the Stuarts, Irish soldiers, diplomatists and statesmen won some of their greatest triumphs. The name of that unfortunate patriot, Lord Edward Fitzgerald, will also be recalled in connection with that Duke of Orleans who followed to the scaffold the royal kinsman whom he betrayed.

THE LANGUAGE QUESTION.

One of the most judicious and equitable contributions to the discussion of the Dual language question in the Dominion has come to us in the form of a lecture delivered before the professors and students of the University of New Brunswick, on the 18th of March last. The Rev. S. J. Doucet, of Shippegan, had been especially invited by the authorities of the University to give his views on this vexed question. The very heading that Mr. Doucet chose for his essay indicated an intention to treat his topic purely on its merits. "Dual Language in Canada: its advantages and disadvantages." Such is Mr. Doucet's title, and his opening words are in harmony with it. "Theoretically," he admits, "it might be desirable to have only one language in Canada, and it may be a matter of regret that things were allowed to take their present course." He then goes on to mention some of the drawbacks that the use of two languages in the same country may seem to imply. These are that, being a source of enmity and strife, it is incompatible with national unity and progress; that it necessitates an increased outlay in the publication of parliamentary and legal documents in both tongues; that it divides the forces by which the nation is educated and by which a national literature is created; and that in commercial relations and social intercourse it exerts an injurious influence. The lecturer does not deny that in the highest sense national unity implies unity of language. But, in his opinion, when strictly defined, it implies a great deal more—not unity of language merely, but unity of origin, growth and development, unity of manners and customs and unity of religion. But the attainment of such unity is so rare in the political adjustments of modern times, due to conquest, treaties and other conventions and understandings, that it may be pronounced impracticable. There is no nation in Europe that is entirely in accord with the requirements of a unity so all-pervading. Besides, if we admit the possibility of such unity, the constant tendency of modern life, quite apart from language, is to destroy it. The social distinctions due to the unequal distribution of this world's goods, the warfare of political parties, clashings of interest between employers and employed, and various other causes of dissension, are perpetually at work as if for the purpose of rending the body politic in pieces. Again, wars of religion have desolated countries in which the antagonists spoke the same language. One of the most sanguinary and obstinate of modern struggles arose between two sections of a nation which recognized but one language for its official acts.

But an authoritative declaration that there is but one legal speech in a country does not alter the fact that there are many languages spoken and taught within its boundaries. In France, for instance, which seems as to language the most unitary of European lands, there are not only a great many dialects of French, but Basque and Armorican, Catalanian and Italian, and Provençal has once more become a literary language. Again, in Spain, besides Basque and Catalan, there is a great diversity of pro-Latin forms, and in the South dialects that would be hardly intelligible in the Asturias. Turin, Florence, Trieste, Naples, Palmero, Sardinia and Corsica are the homes of ever so many varieties of the common national tongue. The German, French and Italian cantons do not impair the unity of Switzerland. The dual monarchy has more than two legal languages—Magyar, Czech, Polish, Roumanian and German being the main tongues spoken and taught. Russia, Belgium, the Norse Kingdoms, the German Empire and (need we add?) the great Victorian realm are virtually Polyglot. There is, indeed, hardly a language spoken in the great peopled quarters of the globe that is not in use in some portion of the British Empire. He would be a ready man in a more than Baconian sense who could without hesitation give a list of the languages spoken by the Queen's subjects. The alien "colonies" of London are so many as to constitute that city a veritable cosmopolis. The native tongues and dialects of the British Isles disclose to the philologist the successive stocks, racial and linguistic, that have gone to the making of the inhabitants. The Celtic foundation is abundantly evident. Some go so far as to argue in favor of a pre-Celtic element, of which they find traces in some local names. That element is not, however, obvious, like the Celtic, which its friends are determined to save from extinction. The Teutonic elements are present in the language as well as well as in the geographical names. The Norman is spoken in the channel islands, which represent the old Duchy of the Conqueror and are thus historically Suzerain to England. The growth of English, as well as the survival of Erse, Gælic, Manx and Welsh, testify to the impossibility of repressing a language by legal enactments.

How many tongues are spoken in Canada to-day? Not without taking thought can such a question be answered. Of the native tongues alone the name is legion. And what language of Europe, not to speak of Asia, is unrepresented in the daily spoken speech of the people of the Dominion. No law could silence these languages as the means of household and social intercourse for thousands of our fellow-citizens. In Lord Durham's famous Report, the principle which is essentially unitary, it was proposed to forbid the official use of the French language. Such a course was believed to be alone consistent with the union of the two provinces, and the prohibition was embodied in the Union Act. But from the first it was a dead letter in the Union Legislature and before ten years had gone by the repressive clause was repealed. Lord Elgin, though he was Lord Durham's son-in-law, was opposed to all such attempts at denationalization. Such a policy may be in keeping with Russian traditions and aims; it is unworthy of a nation that professes to love freedom and to respect the rights of others.

But is the question merely one of forbearance, of toleration? Is it purely an act of magnanimity on the part of the English-speaking majority in the Dominion to permit the descendants of the old lords of the soil to speak aloud on the floor of Parliament the language of Montaigne, of Racine, of Molière, of Massillon, of Montesquieu, of Chateaubriand, of Sainte Beuve? Surely it is not entirely a disadvantage for our people to be led by such gentle urging as is implied by correctly spoken French to the study of some of the world's grandest masterpieces. Already, what literature Canada has produced is dual, and its French section is not without acceptance in the ancient land whose kings founded new France. We do not decline whatever credit that distinction brings to the Dominion as a whole. Would the writers who have won the approval of France's highest critical tribunal have been equally fortunate if they had adopted another language instead of their ancestral tongue? Assuredly no. There is in the use of a language, cherished as their mother tongue is by the French-Canadian people, an incentive to excellence that acts like inspiration. M. Doucet quotes the words of that esteemed friend of Canada, the late M. Xavier Marmier, in proof of the unimpaired descent of the heirloom so highly prized. "It retains," says M. Marmier, "the eloquence of the *Grand Siecle*." That testimony is precious. Not for a mere *patois*, not for a corrupt idiom or weakened echo of a great original, does this Acadian priest plead so eloquently, but for a birthright that has come down untarnished from the time of Bossuet and Corneille.

THE Register, of Toronto, says that Mr. Coatsworth has fallen in a good cause and without a stain on his reputation as a politician or as a man.

BISHOP FALIZE, on the occasion of his silver jubilee recently, ordained the first priest in Norway since the days of the Reformation.

RETROSPECT AND FORECAST.

The return to power in the Federal sphere of the Reform or Liberal party, after a long interval of continuous Conservative administration, suggests a brief retrospect which may enlighten our younger readers and refresh the memories of the more mature. The origin and growth of our Canadian parties, while in the main due to the same causes and effected by the same influences to which corresponding organizations elsewhere owe their birth and development, have also been shaped by motives, aims and prejudices both diverse and peculiar. When we attempt to trace them further back than the year 1867 we have to take a survey of from four to eight communities each of them with its own inheritance of divisions and conflicts. For, although we are wont to regard the Dominion as a political unit, it is a unit made up of several provincial groups and every such group has its own predominant traditions and interests. On the other hand, in so far as Confederation succeeded the Union regime in the central and most important provinces of the Dominion, we are tempted to look to the party organization of pre-federal years as that from which our actual system proceeded. To this pedigree (apart from its leaving the other provinces out of account) it may be objected that, as the federal scheme had its origin in a coalition of the old Upper and Lower Canadian parties, there was really no party in existence when the Dominion began its constitutional life on the 1st of July, 1867. Certainly that was the theory of the Fathers of Confederation. Old feuds were to be forgotten, and as Grit and Tory had united for the patriotic purpose of founding a nation, that nation was to begin its progress unhampered by the *impedimenta* of old antagonisms. And to the majority of our people, in that first federal summer, such a principle seemed not impracticable. There was, it is true, in Nova Scotia an opposition to the inclusion of that province in the federation too influential to be ignored, and the "antis" (as they were called) had sympathizers both in Quebec and Ontario. But it was not from the "antis" that the proposal to commence our new *modus vivendi* on a party basis first emanated. We are surveying the past from the standpoint of history, not of partizanship, and we neither praise nor blame those who deemed it best to anticipate that partition on party lines which was sure to come sooner or later. Nor need we pause to consider how far personal anti-party was an element in the Hon. George Brown's withdrawal from the coalition with which he had loyally collaborated until the great end of the federal constitution had been attained. Suffice it to say that the Liberal party as (with certain modifications from the influence of the other provinces) it exists to-day with the Hon. Wilfred Laurier triumphantly at its head, had its cradle in the convention that Mr. Brown invited to meet at Toronto on the 27th of June, 1867. Of course, the 650 local leaders who answered his summons were not altogether novices in political affairs. They were all or nearly all Reformers of the Globe school, of which Mr. Brown, whether in office or out of office, whether formally appointed or simply accepted, was the recognized leader. As such they were either a portion of (or the heirs of) the Remnant that declined to give its adhesion to the coalition of 1854. From that year, in fact, dates the organization of the two political forces that have since alternately, for good or evil, swayed the destinies of Canada—first the Canada of the Union and afterwards the larger Canada of the British North America Act. Some of our readers can doubtless recall the peculiar conditions that led to the formation of the McNab-Morin Cabinet. Therewith the old Toryism, if it did not die the death, took to the bed from which it never rose. It was succeeded by that new Conservatism which, from the circumstances of its birth, its supporters and the approval of Robert Baldwin, has considered itself not unworthy of the name of Liberal. It was a Liberal-Conservative Cabinet that inaugurated Confederation. But it must not be forgotten that Mr. Brown and some of those who followed him into opposition had served the same cause, while other Liberals (like the Hon. A. A. Dorion and the Hon. J. S. Macdonald) who opposed Confederation on principle, while the question was still *sub judice*, gave it a large support when it became an accomplished fact. For a time the conciliation of Nova Scotia seemed hopeless, Dr. (now Sir) Charles Tupper standing virtually alone against a solid phalanx of bitter Antis led by the veteran Joseph Howe. Ultimately, after a sharp struggle, Mr. Howe was won over to the side that he had denounced and took office in Sir John Macdonald's Cabinet. The first Dominion Parliament opened on the 7th of November, 1867. The Hon. James Cockburn was elected Speaker of the Commons (then a new word on Canadian lips) and the Hon. J. E. Cauchon was appointed to preside over the Senate. The principle of dual representation was then permitted, and some of the ablest men in