

THE TRUE WITNESS

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED

At 761 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES:

One Year.....\$1.50
If paid strictly in advance.....1.00

All Business letters, and Communications intended for publication, should be addressed to J. P. WHELAN, Proprietor of THE TRUE WITNESS, No. 761 Craig street, Montreal, P.Q.

DECISIONS REGARDING NEWSPAPERS

1. Any person who takes a paper regularly from the post-office, whether directed in his name or another's or whether he has subscribed or not, is responsible for payment.
2. If a person orders his paper discontinued, he must pay up all arrears, or the publisher may continue to send it until payment is made, and when collection has failed, whether the paper is taken from the office or not.

WEDNESDAY.....FEBRUARY 6, 1889

CALENDAR FOR THE WEEK.

WEDNESDAY, Feb. 6th, St. Titus.
THURSDAY, Feb. 7th, St. Romauld.
FRIDAY, Feb. 8th, St. John de Matha.
SATURDAY, Feb. 9th, St. Raymond de Penafort.
SUNDAY, Feb. 10th, 5th after Epiphany.
MONDAY, Feb. 11th, St. Genevieve.
TUESDAY, Feb. 12th, St. Ildophonso.

The Evangelical Business.

Certain gentlemen who took a prominent part in the attacks on the Catholic Church at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in this city last fall, renewed their assaults in the same direction at Toronto in the recent meeting of a branch of the Alliance at that city. We gather from the Mail's report that "the evils associated with the domination of the Roman Catholic Church" were carried as "a matter of urgency" into the Toronto meeting.

As a rule Catholics take no notice of these assaults, nor would they be noticed in THE TRUE WITNESS, were it not that these Evangelical bigots may possibly succeed in their reprehensible purpose of inflaming the minds of the less intelligent and moderate among Protestants, and thus lead to dissensions which can be productive of nothing but misery to the dupes of fanaticism.

In confirmation of the last part of the foregoing sentence, it must be borne in mind that Mr. Macdonald's was one of the two signatures attached to the petition to the Governor-General-in-Council against the passing of the Jesuits' Estates bill, which was presented by the Evangelical Alliance, of Montreal, on January 13th, a document which urges Protestant views in the most direct manner.

Conversing with a representative of the Mail Rev. W. Reid, D. D., said that "it was not the intention of the Evangelical Alliance to come out as a political engine to endeavor to overturn the machinations of Romanism. The aim of the Alliance lay rather in the direction of promoting unity of action in spiritual work, and in fostering a friendly spirit among the various evangelical denominations. It had in past times undertaken successful work in the direction of Sabbath observance, and at one time held weekly meetings for prayer and exhortation, which, he thought, were beneficial to the spiritual life of the communities referred to."

not a matter beyond fair, reasonable adjustment. Nor is its settlement likely to be promoted by violent denunciations of the Catholic Obshob. What then, is the cause of all the row?

Simply this: Protestantism, honyoombed with Rationalism and Infidelity, is deceiving at a rate that appals its ministers, who raise the anti-Catholic cry with the hope of arresting the depopulation of their churches. It will be observed that the speeches of the Evangelicals are more political than religious. They affect to be terrified at the power exercised by the Catholic Church, but surely they do not expect to lessen that power, founded as it is, on population and constitutional right by wildly haranguing against "Romanism?" Their speeches have not disturbed the Mercer government, nor have they even stirred up a single Protestant member of the Legislature to object to the settlement. Sir John Macdonald was equally deaf to Evangelical objections.

Now these facts prove either of two things, namely, the provincial and federal governments and legislatures do not share the apprehensions of the Evangelical alarmists, or Catholics are too powerful and their attitude too correct for any government to assail them with impunity. We believe both points are founded in truth and reason. The conclusion, therefore, is that the No Popery addition to the Evangelical blazon has been made on business principles and will be worked for all it is worth for a very palpable, if not very elevated, purpose.

Sir John Macdonald and the Workingmen.

Workingmen who approach Sir John Macdonald to urge on him the adoption of manhood suffrage and other measures looking to the increase of political power among the laboring classes, must have done so for the purpose of presenting their views only, or else they have given but a very superficial study to the man, his policy and methods.

Had they followed the line of thought here suggested they would have long ago been convinced of the utility of applying to end intent upon founding an aristocracy and devoted to Imperialism, for legislation utterly incompatible with, and subversive of his most cherished designs. They would also have discovered that, even were he ever so willing to accede to their demands as a matter of expediency, he could not do so without jeopardizing his position. Workingmen are probably aware, or they ought to be, that in the eyes of Conservative statesmen "a Penniless Omnipotence is an insupportable presence."

If they will only observe and think, workmen must see that the secret of Sir John Macdonald's policy has always been the concentration, not the dispersion, of wealth and property: in principle, it is precisely the same as that which prompted aristocratic governments everywhere to place the burden of taxation in whole or most part on the working class while keeping them in ignorance and impressing them with superstitious awe of rank and power.

democracy individual property can only be permanently sustained by diffusion, and, if existing conditions have isolated it in the hands of the few, the many will lie under a constant, and in emergencies, an irresistible temptation to take freedom in their hands, and force the distribution of property by law, or nationalise it entirely by a socialistic reconstruction." The wealthy and privileged classes have so long been accustomed to make the laws in their own interest that they have come to regard their system as the only really sound one. They held and still hold the truth of the maxim that power must be distributed in some proportion to property, and stand aghast at the democratic alternative proposition that property must be distributed in some proportion to power. This is really what the workingmen mean when they approach the Premier with suggestions for radical legislation, but he sees further than they do. To accede to their demands he knows would be tantamount to signing his own political death warrant.

Let not the laborers deceive themselves. Sir John Macdonald has already been compelled to make his choice and cannot change it. His system, his power, nay, his very existence, is bound up with the privileged class his policy has created. His providence is for those who employ, not for those who are employed. Living as he does in a period of rapid transition, expediency has had as much to do with fixing his course as natural bent. But workingmen may rest assured that so long as he can command the support of cotton lords, sugar kings, iron barons and others of that ilk, he will not legislate in a way to make the hands politically independent of their employers.

Yet all Sir John Macdonald or any other man can do against the advancing tide is really very little and of ephemeral effect. "The gradual development of the principle of equality," says de Tocqueville, "is a Providential fact. It has all the characteristics of such a fact. It is universal; it is durable; it constantly eludes all human interference; and all events, as well as men, contribute to its progress. Would it be wise to imagine that a social movement, the causes of which lie so far back, can be checked by the efforts of one generation? Can it be believed that the democracy which has overthrown the feudal system and vanquished kings will retreat before tradesmen and capitalists? Will it stop now that it has grown so strong, and its adversaries so weak?"

France.

General Boulanger's success in rallying to his support a sufficient number of Parliamentarians to give him a majority of eighty thousand votes over his opponent, again exposes with painful publicity the innate defects of French republicanism. The evils that now afflict France, the dangers that menace the Republic, are the natural, the inevitable result of her past. In France parliamentary institutions are not, as in England, an evolutionary development, broadening down from precedent to precedent. Properly speaking, France never had a parliament as such understood in England and her colonies.

Among the French, on the contrary, parliamentary institutions had been obliterated for one hundred and seventy five years when Louis XVI. summoned the Estates. In England, the Commons had never been wholly suppressed and had risen to supremacy, not without passing through the fires of revolution. It must be admitted, but always as a living embodiment of the will of the people. Thus the tide of revolution, even to the extreme extent of decapitating a king at one time and deposing a dynasty at another, was made to flow in constitutional channels.

Not so was it in France where parliament, in the modern sense, came into being amid the throes of revolution, thus establishing, as it were, the constitutionality of catastrophe. A National Assembly which, in the assumed name of the people, wiped out the two estates of the nobility and clergy, deposed and executed the king, did not inaugurate an orderly democracy where parties, united on a principle of loyalty, might fairly vie with each other on questions of policy, but a system of revolutions where opposing parties not only sought to change the personnel of the government, but also its fundamental principle.

the Monarchy and the Empire. Thus it has been the object of each party to seize the power of the State, but none has sought to circumscribe its range. Nor could it be otherwise when parties are disposed in the way we have seen. Whillet all sought liberty for themselves, they each were afraid to grant it to their opponents, for fear those opponents should get the authority of this powerful centralised system of government into their hands and use it to deprive them of liberty.

Here lies the secret of the instability of French governments. With all her marvellous efforts to establish freedom, France has never enjoyed it. Perhaps, too, from this pathetic story of national failures we may learn that, in spite of the ghastly experience of two experiments in Imperialism, the French people look with hope even to so manifest a charlatan as Boulanger. It would seem as if they longed to realize Carlyle's ideal of "a strong man," who could overcome the factions and reduce chaos to order and stability.

The man on horseback is not a desirable ruler, yet France, like all republics, has a strange love for him, and when he appears is ready to fall down and worship him. Of this character France has furnished three degrees of comparison; positive, Napoleon Bonaparte, comparative, Louis Napoleon, superlative, Boulanger. From the positive genius we descend through the comparative camp to the superlative humberg. Like Byron, France wants a hero—

"A Man Who Kens and Cons."

—Where are my friends, the Whigs? Exactly where they were. —Byron. Substitute the word "Grits" for "Whigs" in the above, and the quotation admirably describes the present political situation in federal affairs.

Outside the manufacturing centres and a few constituencies dominated by Orangemen, the Macdonald ministry has really no hold on the country. But, as Carlyle says, "much is possible to a man; men will obey a man who Kens and Cons." Sir John Macdonald is a man of this kind. Having once obtained a majority in parliament he used it to legislate in a way to fix his yoke permanently on the Dominion. Cynically devoid of confidence in the democratic doctrine that the nearer government comes to the people and the closer it is under popular control, the better for the State, he rearranged the boundaries of constituencies and took into his own hands the regulation of the franchise. To complete the system of uncrowned autocracy working through the forms of constitutional usage, he assumed the right of nomination to parliament within his party and endowed his own sworn partisans with absolute discretion as returning officers.

It was necessary, however, that he should have a party of his own outside parliament—a party of interest, not principle—on whose selfishness he could rely for supplies of the sinews of war. Having no natural aristocracy like that on which English Tory statesmen can always depend when contemplating raids on popular rights and the earnings of the masses, he set to work to create a plutocracy. To use his own elegant simile, he "climbed the tree and shook down the nuts to the hogs." Id est, he made laws concerning trade and commerce whereby certain favored individuals were enabled to bloom out as

millionaires through the abolition of competition in supplying the food and clothing of the people. "The hogs" were properly grateful. When he called upon them at Montreal and Toronto to come down handsomely with subscriptions to his election fund, they responded of course, and furthermore were obliged to the extent of two hundred thousand dollars to enable him to set up a special newspaper organ to take the place of the Mail, which had repudiated and defamed him. Thus armed and equipped he went to the constituencies. For individual vote sellers the hard cash was forthcoming, and for constituencies en bloc he presented the open wholesale bribes of railway subsidies and public works.

Here we have the secret of Sir John Macdonald's success. He Kens and Cons.

The people don't want him, never really put any faith in him, and were he to appeal to them on his record to-morrow, as Mr. Mackenzie innocently did in 1878, he would be beaten out of sight. Canada is not Tory. It is not even Conservative. The vast preponderance of popular sentiment is on the Liberal side. To maintain the semblance of a Tory government at Ottawa and Sir John Macdonald in power, the people have been forced to pay against their will hundreds of millions of dollars, besides being plunged in debt beyond hope of redemption.

But a greater misfortune than the loss of millions, a more paralyzing affliction than an insupportable debt, is the moral degradation brought upon the whole people by Macdonald's corruptions and debaucheries with the social and political gangrene of his example in evil success.

The Irish Situation.

Events in Ireland during the past week have profoundly stirred the Irish people at home and abroad. Since the beginning of the new year the government has renewed its ferocious policy in the most drastic manner possible under the infamous crimes act. Priests, members of parliament, private citizens, men and women, have been sent to prison right and left on the most flimsy pretences. A perfect reign of terror has been established in the name of law, yet the people endure it all with the most heroic fortitude.

But the great cause of indignation, amounting in some places to exasperation, has been the brutal ill-usage to which Mr. William O'Brien has been subjected in Clonmel jail. It would seem as if Balfour were determined to murder him as he murdered Mr. Mandeville. He has gone too far as it is, and the calmer heads may be unable to control those wilder spirits who are ready to take vengeance on the miscreant Secretary, his abettors and tools. In all movements of this kind there are men who act independently on the impulse of outraged humanity. They are not amenable to discipline and may strike a terrible blow at any moment. This is the great danger that menaces the Irish cause, for nothing would please the Tories and renegade Unionists more than "outrage" traceable to Irishmen. Even Lord Salisbury might, like the pagan king, be not unwilling to see his beloved nephew offered up as a sacrifice, if thereby he could win a victory over the Irish.

At this moment William O'Brien stands forth as the living embodiment of the indomitable determination of the Irish nation to perish rather than submit to a degradation. But there is a greater Ireland outside the Green Isle, and it is from its ranks that the power, with which the Tory government is vainly contending, proceeds. It is an Ireland which cannot be conquered, which grows stronger every day. It has courage, coolness, money and men in millions. With it the Tories must reckon, and by it they must be prepared to suffer the full measure of punishment for their iniquity. More money, more lives may have to be sacrificed, but the crop of armed men coming from the Cadman teeth, sown by centuries of tyranny, is perennial and increases year by year.

The Duke's Defeat.

The Duke of Argyll has ventured to take up the cudgels in defence of the renegade Liberals who deserted Mr. Gladstone, on the Home Rule question, and reply to Mr. Frederick Harrison. The Duke's paper appears in the January Contemporary Review, and is about the most lame and impotent performance, considering the historical importance and political gravity of the subject treated and the toploty assumptions of the writer.

No one, however, will dispute the fitness of the Duke of Argyll for the performance of the task of defending the landlords of Ireland and the Tory ministry which has undertaken their preservation. The descendant of a line of unscrupulous land-grabbers, whose wealth has been derived from robbery, confiscation and treacherly, he of all men is the one who ought to defend a class and a system, by whom and through which, the people of England, Scotland and Ireland were plundered of their natural and legal heritage in the land. In any other man a defence of the penal laws of Ireland would be surprising. When a lineal descendant of the "the base, brutal and bloody Whigs" makes that defence we recognize the fitness of his advocacy while we refuse to admit its justice or logic. The penal laws, he says, were enacted by men "of the Reformed faith who had the best of all reasons for directing penal laws against those who were in standing conspiracy to exterminate themselves." These men "had the toxin of St. Bartholemew's Sunday in their ears," and "that dreadful knell had its lasting reverberations deepened and renewed by the then recent Revocation of the edict of Nantes." In short, the Duke's argument is that it was an age of religious wars and persecutions and English Protestants persecuted Irish Catholics for fear of, or in retaliation, for persecution of Protestants by Catho-

lics in other countries. But he admits that "the penal laws were indeed detestable—judged in the light of our own times and considered as the mere instruments of religious persecution." He holds them execrable, however, because "they were not enacted in defence of tenets, but in defence of institutions." These were "fundamental institutions in which all freedom rested and on which all that was dear to men depended." Finally the Duke declares that the Irish Catholics "were subjected to penal laws because they were then in a standing conspiracy to suppress what they called herey, and as a means of doing so, subvert the monarchy and the laws of England."

Accepting this as the best defence for the cruelest persecution on record, may we ask what excuse it contains for the refusal to do justice to Ireland now that the whole character of the conflict has changed? It is not with the dead past that we of the present day have to deal. Certain conditions have been bequeathed, or have resulted from the past. The duty of the men of to-day is to modify or abolish them, so that modern economical principles and forces may have proper play. Landlordism is one of the worst—the very worst we think—of these conditions. There can be no peace, no progress till it is removed. The government or the class who think to preserve it by acts of coercion and such infernal methods as Balfour is now prosecuting in Ireland are fighting against fate and doomed to failure. The Duke of Argyll is, of course, defending the land robbers of which he is a prominent member and representative. The notice to quit served on Irish landlords, he expects to see nailed to the gates of Inverary any fine morning. When Irish landlords go down, Scotch and English landlords may prepare to vanish in like manner. This is the terror that inspires the dual pen. Behind Home Rule rises the forehead of Scotch Radicalism and English Democracy. Feudalism in the persons of the Duke of Argyll and the Marquis of Salisbury, is making its last stand, but their resistance is hopeless and can only have the effect of making the coming revolution more thorough, complete and radical.

Last Thursday the Dominion Parliament was opened for despatch of business. If the speech from the throne may be taken as a correct forecast of that business, then we must frankly say that there was very little necessity for holding the session. Not one of the really great questions uppermost in the public mind are alluded to. Ministers seem to imagine that, having fired things to suit themselves, there is no need of further action. We look, however, to the Opposition for an exposition of matters which the Government by silence evinces a disposition to ignore. The success of unrestricted reciprocity at the bye-elections indicates the lines on which the Opposition should proceed, and Mr. Laurier's emphatic declaration of his intention to urge that question has roused popular expectation. The ministry is very much weaker in personnel and in numerical support to what it was last session, and the meagre official programme outlined in the speech from the throne betrays timidity. If it is the intention, as reported, to spring a general election this year, the game of lying low is comprehensible, and should were the Liberals to take every opportunity this session to advance their policy clearly and forcibly before the country, so that in the event of a dissolution they will not be unprepared. The splendid victories in Joliette and Haldimand, by which agricultural constituencies in Quebec and Ontario gave emphatic endorsement to the Liberal policy of Unrestricted Reciprocity, will greatly strengthen the cause of commercial liberation and friendly relations with our neighbors to the south. The Opposition is sound with the farmer, who are not and cannot be benefited by the protective policy. We, therefore, look for a spirited advance all along the line of the Reform ranks.

Mr. Coulter's election in Haldimand is a great triumph for the Liberals and for Unrestricted Reciprocity. The Government made the most desperate and determined efforts to win the constituency and carried it twice by the most flagrant corruption. Now, however, they are beaten handsomely and effectively, despite coercion of Indians, the bribes of a public building at Cayuga and a bridge over the Grand river, costing \$10,000 each. But more significant than all is the fact that Mr. Coulter was elected by a decisive majority in face of the declaration by the Tory press that his return would be regarded and accepted as an electoral manifesto in favor of annexation. If what the organs said be true, the electors of Haldimand prefer Annexation to Macdonaldism—a conclusion we believe not very far from correct.

The terrible tragedy by which Prince Rudolf met his death is deepened by the mystery which surrounds it. Whether he died by his own hand, was killed in a duel or murdered, is still a question, but there can be no doubt that his death was the culmination of a dark tale of misery and crime. Here was a man occupying one of the most envied lots that can fall to any human being; learned, intellectual, with the means of happiness at command, heir to the throne of one of the greatest empires of the earth, yet he has perished miserably in the prime of life, a victim to what appears to have been a domestic trouble. Mated to an incongenial, sterile wife, we know he was, but there must have been something more than that, arising from it in all likelihood, to account for the ghastly termination of his career. But whatever the truth may be the story as far as it is known only goes to prove the old lesson that no mortal is exempt from the sorrows and vicissitudes of life, and that shame and death await