

Northwest Review

"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

THE ONLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTEREST OF ENGLISH SPEAKING CATHOLICS WEST OF TORONTO.

VOL. XI, No. 14.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 9, 1895.

\$ 2.00 per Year.
Single Copies 5 cents.

ITALY'S HOLLOW JUBILEE

A Quarter of a Century of Church Robbery and Unbearable Taxation.

THE FRAUDULENT PLEBISCITE.

Two Sovereigns, Each Recognized by the Powers in the Same City.

(From the American Catholic Quarterly Review for July, 1895).

A DIPLOMATIC ABSURDITY.

We are witnesses of what no other generation of men have ever witnessed. For twenty five years we have seen two sovereigns reigning in the same city—one the rightful sovereign, the other an usurper. The usurper is sitting in the palace of the rightful sovereign and is making laws for him. The rightful sovereign has not gone beyond the bounds of what the usurper accords to him as a "residence" for five and twenty years; and yet the great ones of the earth make journeys of many days to pay court to him in his solitude. You know whom I would name; the Pope and the Prince of the house of Savoy, who is styled the King of "Italy." Who has ever seen two independent sovereigns in the same city? What is the meaning of the double representation of the European court at Rome—one to the Pope and one to the King? It is a diplomatic absurdity such as Europe wide awake has never before been guilty of.

THERE IS A PRISONER IN ROME WHO IS NOT THE POPE.

When Victor Emmanuel entered Rome in 1870 he said: "This is the overthrow of the House of Savoy." About a year before his death he said, whilst gazing one day at the Vatican which held the captive Pius IX: "There is a prisoner here in Rome who is not the Pope." He referred to himself. The sympathies of Victor Emmanuel were with Napoleon III, and the French people. Very naturally, therefore, when Prussia was planning the campaign of 1870, and the downfall of Napoleon III, the Iron Chancellor had to fear lest the Sardinian King might at any moment yield to an impulse of gratitude and cast his arms into the balance on the side of Napoleon III. With the single exception of Sig. Sella, the whole ministry of Emmanuel leaned with the king towards the French allies; Bismarck, therefore, opened negotiations with the Radical section of the Italian Parliament. Through the aid of Cuneo, an old Garibaldian, he drowned the fears of the Radicals, and by the united efforts of Cairoli, Crispi and Nicotera, the tide of public opinion was turned against the French alliance. The question was then raised of taking Rome as the capital of a United Italy. Victor Emmanuel was weak. He feared that resistance to the cry of the Radicals might cost him, at their unscrupulous hands, even the crown he wore. So Napoleon fell and the Piedmontese entered Rome. The unification of Italy, in the minds of those who brought it about, was regarded as a necessarily preliminary step to the destruction of all hereditary rule in Italy and to the destruction of the Papal government. They saw from the beginning the impossibility of setting up the rule of red republicanism in any of the kingdoms, duchies, principalities, that composed the geography of the peninsula. Such a foundation would have been immediately torn up by affrighted neighbors. Hence, wise in their generation, their project has been to unite the separate parts of the geographical expression, piece by piece under the most powerful crown, previous to hurling the crown into the dust at a single blow. The taking of Rome was the last step in unification, which is the first requirement for dissolution. This did not escape Cavour, the originator of the actual unity. As early as 1861 (March 25) he declared from the tribune that the place of the seat of the government at Rome, so as to interfere with the liberty of the Pope, would be "fatal not only to Catholicism, but to Italy." And Gino Caproni, whose ashes have been placed in the Pantheon besides those of Victor Emmanuel, said, before taking Rome: "I believe that the Pope must have a city where there will be no one above him; and I believe

that city must be Rome; and I believe that Rome would be a bad capital for Italy." After Rome had been taken, the same Caproni, blind and feeble, entered the senate at Florence and spoke these foreboding words: "Beware! On the independence of the head of the Church depends our independence; if this independence is not secured we shall not possess Rome really and in security."

THE FRAUDULENT PLEBISCITE AND THE FRAUDULENT "LAW OF GUARANTEES."

Nevertheless, Rome was taken, and, immediately that they might wear before the eyes of the world the garb of liberators, the Piedmontese held what they called a plebiscite, or vote of the people, for or against the Papal rule. The plebiscite was not a vote of the Roman people, but a Piedmontese government falsehood. This is proved by the immediately preceding demonstrations of the people in favor of Pius IX., when the invaders were at the gates. The desire of the people to fall upon the invaders proves it; a desire which Pius IX saw would end in needless bloodshed, and hence, disappointed. The fact that not a sign of exultation was given on the Corso over the triumph proves it. The shop doors were all closed as in mourning, and the drapery that always marks the Roman festival day was not seen upon one balcony on the day named for the celebration. The fact that the palaces and dwellings hung out foreign flags as for protection against an enemy proves it. The protest of the Roman voters, signed with name and residence, prove it. There was not one journal for the invaders established by a Roman. An effort was made to blind the public by keeping the former officials; but they would not hold office under the Piedmontese. The Piedmontese could not find so much as a satisfactory city council of native Romans. But, without going further, the plebiscite itself is proof enough. It was the vote of a mob of ruffians, of criminals and aliens.

But the invaders were ill at ease. In the face of the world they had to make some profession. So they passed the famous law of guarantees, by which they professed to secure to the Pontiff absolute independence, and free control of Catholic institutions in Rome and in the six suburban vicariates. The law was put into execution by stripping the Pontiff of his possessions. On Nov. 7, 1870, less than two months after the invasion, Gen. la Marmora sent word to Pius IX that the Quirinal Palace, the Papal residence, would have to become the property of the State. Pius refused to cede it. A blacksmith was called in; the locks were forced; and on Nov. 10 the Gazzetta Ufficiale del Regno d'Italia announced: "Yesterday at noon the king took possession of the Quirinal." The Pope was allowed the Vatican as a "residence." The guarantees were a lie from the beginning. The "residence" has been turned into a prison. The Sardinians, or Piedmontese—to use the names indifferently—have had control of the telegraphs, the railroads, the mails and of all means of communication between the Pope and the Church. Besides the usurper arrogates to himself the power of a "veto" over the appointment of bishops and pastors. Two years ago there were as many as forty bishops excluded from their sees and prohibited entrance into the houses built for them by the faithful of the dioceses. To understand how free the living Pope is to appear in public, we have but to call to mind the outrages of the mob that attacked the dead body of Pius IX on the night of Sept. 20, 1881, when it was being carried to the tomb in the cemetery of St. Lawrence.

WHOLESALE ROBBERY OF CHURCHES AND RELIGIOUS HOUSES.

As early as 1861, when Victor Emmanuel first took the title of King of Italy, after the seizure of the whole of the peninsula, with the exception of some of the estates of the Church, the government expenditure was \$151,000,000 and the deficit that year was \$60,000,000. From the beginning the church was called upon to pay the debts of the usurping government. The spoliation of Church property for the single year 1876 was reckoned at \$116,000,000. In 1870, after the taking of Rome, when the era of Italian splendor began, this method of raising a revenue

was applied with fitting magnificence to the whole peninsula. Hundreds upon hundreds of churches and monasteries, whose inmates were driven out, were seized and either torn down, sold at auction, or turned into barracks or brothels. For twenty-five years the work has gone on. Church lands have been confiscated, and even the vestments and chalices of the altar have been put up for sale. In this way the Italian parliament, pushed for means to vote its over-swelling budget, has spoiled the Church, and driven out penniless upon the streets, not only religious men, but thousands of peaceful nuns. And, simultaneously with the inauguration of this barbarity, practised upon those whose lives were devoted to prayer and deeds of mercy, the invaders introduced into the city of Rome the reign of blasphemy and public obscenity.

ONE WAY OF RAISING REVENUE.

From the taking of Rome, notwithstanding the colossal spoliations, the deficit in the public treasury went on increasing until, in 1872, the public debt had passed the sum of 1,700 million dollars. In 1872, in spite of an incredible outlay continually augmented, there have been years when the revenue has been made to come near to the expenditure; and thus the debt has not increased each year in the same proportion. How is it that, when the expenditure has been multiplied fabulously year by year, the debt has not always increased in the same proportion? What new source of revenue has sprung up since the taking of Rome? No new source. Not one new source of true revenue has been found or developed since the taking of Rome. The yearly deficit has simply been cancelled in a more gorgeous style by the theft of private property. The Government just condemned your property, sold it at auction, pocketed the money and gave you bonds which will soon be worthless. This was the way in which you made a loan to the Government. We remember how, about a dozen years ago, the famous missionary college of the Propaganda was forced to sell its real estate and accept for the proceeds some Government bonds of half value. This same method of securing a revenue was shortly after about to be applied to the American College at Rome, the property of citizens of the United States. President Arthur regarded the theft as a little too royal for endurance. He sent word to plundering Italy to keep its hands off. It is not necessary to add that his order was obeyed. In this and other kindred ways the treasury has been supplied, and the Government has been able to credit itself with an actual peace army of 800,000 and a war footing of over 3,000,000 soldiers; and this too in a population of 30,000,000 on a territory about three times as large as Ohio, and at an expense for military equipment and maintenance of from \$85,000,000 to \$106,000,000 a year, or from \$250,000 to \$300,000 a day.

TARIFF METHODS OF "NEW ITALY."

Some idea of the tariff methods may be formed from the duties levied upon a few articles of general use. The tax on coffee is twice the value of the coffee. The tax on coal oil is three times the value of the oil. The tax on spirits is five times the value of the spirits. So that for a pound of sugar the people pay the worth of two pounds; for a pound of coffee the worth of three pounds; for a gallon of oil the worth of four gallons and for a gallon of spirits the worth of six gallons. Salt is made in Italy, but the people have to pay forty times the cost of production, thus paying three or four times the price that is paid even in countries where no salt is produced. This means that the consumer pays \$4 for a bag of salt which has been made at an outlay of 10 cents. A man living on the seashore is allowed to draw one pail a day from the deep. Thus is the government monopoly guarded that the poor man, with the ocean rolling at his feet, might not escape paying high tariff on his pinch of salt.

AN EVER-INCREASING PUBLIC DEBT CRUSHING THE PEOPLE INTO HELPLESS POVERTY AND WHOLESALE EMIGRATION.

In 1869—that is, just before the occupation of Rome and the establishment of "Italy"—there were, it is said, about 70,000 Italians, all told, in the United States. At present we think it nothing

to receive that many in a year. In 1869 the total emigration from Italy was 23,000. In 1876 it rose only to 29,000. In 1879 it leaped up to 119,821. In 1887 153,000 Italians emigrated to America alone. In 1888 the number of emigrants that left from the single port of Genoa alone was 181,000, and the total emigration in the same year was 290,736, a figure which put Italy, in this respect, ahead of all the continental nations.

The condition of wretchedness to which the people have been reduced has some times been spoken of openly in Parliament.

Deputy Romano (speech of Dec. 12, 1885) describes the state of Italy as being even then one of "general distress and misery, with the exception of a few colossal old fortunes, and some new ones, the fruit of public wrong." He said there was a general struggle for existence by one class of society, which detests the other, believing it to be the cause of its misfortunes, though the true cause is bad government." They were suffering, he said, "all the consequences of ill-advising hunger, deterioration of character, immorality, the mania of place-hunting, the emigration of those who do not wish to be obliged to choose between a wretched occupation and crime, smuggling, usury, crime and suicides, and an unnecessary discontent that is undermining our constitutions and the tranquillity of the State." (Translation of Rt. Rev. John O'Connor, D. D., in the American Catholic Quarterly Review, April, 1886.)

The Italian public debt was:

In 1861,	\$600,000,000.
In 1872,	\$1,700,000,000.
In 1876,	\$1,800,000,000.
In 1890,	2,500,000,000.

This is exclusive of a communal debt of \$250,000,000. Thus has the debt grown in time of peace and in those early days when a nation is supposed to be practising the economy so necessary to insure its existence. The tax necessary to pay the interest on the debt, over and above the tax required to meet the fabulous running expenses is \$4.50 per head of the total population of 30,000,000 people, while in England it is \$3.75; in Austria, \$3; in Prussia \$2.50 and in Russia, \$1.50. The amount of revenue spent since 1872 is something like \$5,300,000,000, and the expenditure of the past ten years shows an increase of 30 per cent., as compared with that of the ten years preceding. But the revenue has been steadily decreasing. The sources of plunder have been exhausted one by one, and the natural sources of revenue, when dried at the fountain, cannot be expected to be perennial or to replenish themselves. The revenue was:

In 1889-90,	\$380,000,000.
In 1890-91,	\$379,000,000.
In 1891-92,	\$355,000,000.
In 1892-93,	\$233,000,000.

A CASE OF EMIGRATION OR STARVATION.

Once when King Humbert complained to Sindaco Mercatelli of the flood of emigrants pouring out of the country, Mercatelli replied that it was simply a case of emigration or starvation, and when the King asked him why he did not try to supply the lack of agriculture by the promotion of manufactures, Mercatelli answered: "We have no capital." And when the king urged further, that 2,000,000 lire (\$400,000) would be sufficient to start some kind of manufactures, the city treasurer (it was at Ravenna, before the present crisis), broke in: "Perhaps Your Majesty would find us 2,000,000 lire." At this, it is said, the King looked serious. And then Crispi, when called upon to give his attention to the matter, goes off and writes letters, stating that he has been studying the situation, and that the solution of the problem will be the glory of Humbert's reign!!! We have before us, now, the solution and the glory.

About the vandalism of the Italian Government, I shall say but a word. It would form the subject of a long and annoying discourse. Suffice it to state that the Government has renewed the work of the barbarians, defacing or tearing down the ancient ruins and architectural wonders that formed the study of the visiting world and linked our age of steam with the patience and magnificence of the past. "Ouida" writing in the North American Review (October 1888), says: "All over the land destruction of the vilest and most vulgar kind is at work; destruction before which the more excusable and more virile destruc-

tion of war looks almost noble. For the present destruction has no other motive, object, or mainspring than the lowest greed." To such an extent was this carried on that, as we remember, a few years ago the German archaeologists made an appeal to the world, and the artists and scholars of Europe called upon the Sardinian Government to give over its vandalism. Every body knows Da Vinci's masterpiece, "The Last Supper." Da Vinci lived in an age of great painters. He excelled all the painters of his day. "The Last Supper" is his greatest work, and we may say, the greatest work that has ever been produced. He painted it upon the wall of the refectory in the Convent of Santa Maria delle Grazie, at Milan. This painting is styled, simply, the highest effort of Christian art. The Italian Government turned that refectory into a stable and left the marvellous work of art to the horses. A move was even made to destroy the wondrous relic, the Mausoleum of Hadrian, the castle of San Angelo, for the purpose of widening a street.

CRISPI'S DECLARATION REGARDING THE POPE.

The one person who has made himself signally notorious during the short life of the Kingdom of Italy, is Signor Crispi, who held the office of Prime Minister for about four years, and who was forced to retire in January, 1891. In 1864 Crispi was a member of the Piedmontese Parliament, the Parliament of Victor Emmanuel, at Florence. In one of his Parliamentary speeches of that year we read the following words: "The Roman Pontiff cannot become a citizen of a great State. He must be a prince second to no one." In six years Crispi had become the open enemy of Pope and King, for, in 1870, we find him one of that notorious committee which put to the Piedmontese Ministry this ultimatum: "Order the troops to march upon Rome or we shall proclaim the republic and the downfall of the monarchy." Crispi had become the tool of the advanced revolutionists; and by a strange paradox of history, as we have seen these Italian Jacobins were the tools of Bismarckian despotism. Prussia allowed them to satisfy their hatred of religion by thus forcing Victor Emmanuel on to Rome under threat of his crown, in order that through them Victor Emmanuel might be kept from an alliance with Napoleon III., with whom Prussia was just then at war.

Crispi, as an agent of the revolution, has been more daring than his predecessors, the Prime Ministers Cavour, D'Azeglio and Depretis. He has been no lover of the illegitimate government he has made a show of serving. And though he has been busy attacking the Pope, it is not that he has hated the monarchy less, but that with the heart of the renegade he hates the Church more. He knew from the beginning that the greatest obstacle to the destruction of civil order was the Church. I quote from the Riforma, his organ: "In Italy among the Master Masons we count the illustrious head of the Government. His late conduct has been rigorously in keeping with Masonic principles." What these are in Italy we learn from a circular issued by the Grand Orient of Italy towards the end of 1886. This circular declares that "the suppression of religious orders, the confiscation of ecclesiastical goods and the destruction of the temporal power, form the granite base upon which Masonry must rise." D'Azeglio had said long ago, at Turin, that for them the Roman question was a question of hate.

ENACTMENT OF A PENAL CODE AGAINST THE CHURCH.

The long continued and ever growing protests of eighteen years against the desecration and spoliation of the usurping government; moreover, the magnificent proclamation of Leo's sovereignty made by the world irrespective of creed at the time of the Papal jubilee, all this has driven the terror-stricken revolutionary Parliament to the passage of a penal code such as England never applied to Ireland in Ireland's darkest days. It came from that party which blazoned liberty and equality on its banners, but which has never been known to allow even liberty of speech to any adversary whom it could crush by main force. According to this new code, any

(Continued on page 2)