

The True Witness
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
A WEEKLY EDITION OF THE
"EVENING POST"
IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY
WEDNESDAY.
—AT—
761 CRAIG STREET,
MONTREAL.
By M. C. MULLIN & CO. Proprietors.
Terms (by Mail) \$1.50 per Annum in advance
City (Delivered) \$2.00
MONTREAL, WEDNESDAY, JAN. 15.

NOTICE.

Subscribers should notice the date on the label attached to their paper, as it marks the expiration of their term of subscription.

Subscribers who do not receive the TRUE WITNESS regularly should complain direct to our Office. By so doing the postal authorities can be the sooner notified, and the error, if there be any, rectified at once. See to it that the paper bears your proper address.

Subscribers, when requesting their address to be changed, will please state the name of the Post Office at which they have been receiving their papers, as well as their new address. When making remittances, always date your letter from the Post Office address at which you receive your paper.

Special Notice.

Subscribers, when writing to this office, will kindly date their letters from the postoffice at which they receive the TRUE WITNESS, and thereby save us much time and trouble in attending to their correspondence.

The Zulu War.

The annexation of the South African Boers of the Transvaal Republic brought about the Zulu war. The Boers and the Zulus had been enemies, and when England annexed the Transvaal she opened the quarrels between the Boers and the Zulus. The Zulus beat the Boers, routed their forces in the field, and the Boers saw their only salvation in annexation. But annexation has neither, so far, saved the Boers nor conquered the Kafirs. The small force at the command of the Cape Government has not only made no headway against the Kafirs, but the Kafirs have defied the British troops and their Boer allies combined. King Cetshwayo, the Kafir chief, can, it is said, place 100,000 well armed fighting men in the field. The country they hold is said to be an exceptionally defensive one, and he has been encouraged by the successes which have hitherto attended his efforts. That he will be defeated, everybody outside the Kafir world knows to be a certainty. But the war is expensive and inglorious.

Trouble in the Northwest.

Trouble has been brewing for some time in the Northwest territory. Sitting Bull is killing the buffalo, and the Plain Crees and other Indian tribes are becoming threateningly dissatisfied. The other day, we learn, they stopped surveyors at work, and they have defied, or succeeded in abolishing, the buffalo ordinance which provides that certain periods of the year, Governor Laird says that in ten years the buffalo will have disappeared, but we interpret the defiance as a protest against the ordinance to the fact that buffalo is already becoming very scarce, and that the Indians find themselves obliged to kill it whenever they get a chance. All reports—private or public—tend in the one direction: the buffalo is dying out; the Indians are consequently dissatisfied and almost threatening, and the settlers are anxious and somewhat uneasy. At such a time as this it is of importance that the Northwest territory should be free from turmoil. The country is being settled up, immigrants will soon be flocking to it again, and disturbance would retard the work of taking up the land. Of course party papers will throw the blame on the late administration; and other party papers will try and fix the blame on the present Government; but the public will look to the stern facts that there is something wrong, and whoever was to blame, the people of Canada will look to the administration of to-day, to do justice to all concerned.

Free Church and State Church.

The Presbyterians have two churches, the "Free Church" and the "Church of Scotland." They are both Presbyterian, but yet there is a great deal of difference between them. The Free Churchmen are narrow in their views; the men of the Church of Scotland are broad. The one looks at everything from a Free Church point of view, the other looks at everything from a Christian standpoint. As an illustration of this we may point to the threats of the Free Churchmen against the establishment of a Catholic hierarchy in Scotland; and to the fact that the men of the Church of Scotland in effect said: "If the Pope wants to establish a Catholic hierarchy in Scotland, it is his own business and not ours." With Presbyterianism in its religious aspect we have nothing to do. We have no desire to haul religion into newspaper warfare at all. As far as we are concerned we wish everyone to be allowed to go their way in peace. Polemical discussions had better be confined to the pulpits, or to such papers as are religious, and religious only. In noticing the difference between the Free Church and the Church of Scotland, we only notice an outward fact in order to enable people, if there are any, who do not know the difference, to see that one is far more liberal towards Catholics than the other. Some people will think this liberty an evil; some will think it a blessing; but one thing is certain, that Catholics will naturally warm to those who are willing to treat them fairly, and who do not harbour absurd prejudices against them.

Our Railways in Danger.

The old saying that "misfortunes never come alone, but in battalions," appears to apply to most Canadian institutions just now. Were it not that we have been promised Protection, the country would, if all accounts are to be believed, be lost beyond redemption. The hard times, the shrinkage, the increase of crime, and all their attendant evils have already sobered the sides of all classes of people, and now another misfortune threatens to place our railways at the mercy of Vanderbilt. If reports are to be trusted, the great American Railway King has obtained almost complete control over the Canada Southern Railway, the Michigan Central line, which was independent and used to work in connection with the Grand Trunk and Great Western railways; and he is in general manœuvring so as to use the railways for the advantage of New York, and the disadvantage of Montreal and Quebec. A writer in the *Mail*, who handles his subject as

if he understood it, says that Vanderbilt "is now bent on crippling the Grand Trunk, and seeking to shut off the two great Canadian lines from the transport trade from the West to the seaboard." If this be true, Canadian capitalists must bestir themselves, or Canadian interests will be jeopardised. Out of the transport trade, and Canada is undone. The immense work done to our canals will have been comparatively useless if this scheme of Vanderbilt's is accomplished. We all know that the receipts of the Grand Trunk are growing less year by year; and the writer in the *Mail* attributes this to the manner in which Vanderbilt is controlling all the lines that connect with it for the purpose of forcing the carrying trade by New York. Let this be once accomplished and annexation will only be a question of a very short time. As Canadians do not at present desire annexation, it would be well for them to keep a sharp lookout ahead or they may find themselves seriously discussing the question before they well know where they are.

The Lieutenant-Governor.

If the Conservatives are wise they will allow the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Quebec to remain in undisturbed possession of his position. If they wish to keep on Americanizing the country they will dismiss Mr. Letellier; if they wish to conserve British customs they will retain him. The present administration has already dismissed enough of the officials of the late Government. It has already proved that it is partisan with a vengeance, and to continue this policy of dismissals will leave the administration open to the charge of being moved by a spirit of spite. Mr. Letellier made a mistake. He committed what appears to be an offence against constitutional Government. He placed Party before country, and at a critical moment he played into the hands of his own friends. But Mr. Letellier, as a Reformer, did no more than most of the other party would do as Conservatives. The tendency of public life is to make men consider party above all, and until that tendency is destroyed nine Lieutenant-Governors out of ten would have done, under similar circumstances, as Mr. Letellier did. To remove him will not remedy the matter in the least. It will be a punishment, but it will not alter the *morale* of the people. The true way of controlling such acts, as that committed by Mr. Letellier, is to cultivate a higher political standard, and to teach men that it is not for fast and loose principles of Conservatives or Reformers that men must labor, but for what is best, and for the country at large. Mr. Letellier is a Reformer, and because of that he fell; if Mr. Letellier had been a Canadian patriot he would not have fallen at all. To Mr. Letellier the triumph of his party was everything; and for that triumph he made what looks like a grave error. But his dismissal would simply make matters worse. The Reformers will be in power some time, and they will then remember every dismissal that is now made—and so the war of party retaliation will go on to the end. Better begin true Reform in time, and cease those dismissals, which do an infinity of harm.

Our Canals.

Are the millions of money spent in digging our Canals to be lost? Is the labour of years to be deranged, and the trade of the country diverted from the St. Lawrence and forced to go by New York? The business men of New York are doing all in their power to attract the trade of the West to their port, and it will require the best efforts of Canadians, notwithstanding that we have the shortest route to the sea, to counteract the influence of the New York merchants. The Americans are thwarting us at every turn. We deepen and widen our Canals, in order to allow large vessels to pass through, and the astute Yankees threaten to abolish all tolls on the Erie Canal and thus try and check the advantages we had gained by our enormous outlay. Whether such a stroke of business would have the desired effect or not, it is not easy to say, but we may rest assured that the New York business men, with Vanderbilt at their head, will do all in their power to attract the trade of the West to themselves. And the question occurs—Is Canada equal to the task of meeting such an opposition? We not only think she is, but we are sure of it. A glance at the map must convince anyone that the advantages are ours, but it will require more alive to the gravity of the situation to meet and thwart the danger as it stands. If carrying trade slips through our fingers it will be our own fault. Apart from the commercial ruin which such a calamity would entail, it would, of necessity, result in Annexation. The tendency of modern life is towards the possession of wealth, and as the *Times* said some few months ago—Canadian loyalty would soon be cast overboard if the pockets of Canadians were drained, and their country ruined because of a sentiment. To guard against this evil is one of the duties of the day, and our statesmen and our merchants want all their wits about them, if Canada is to remain, as we all want her to remain, a constitutionally governed colony under the Crown.

Protection.

People in clubs, and in the streets, talk as if Protection was impossible. Even some Conservatives doubt the practicability of the proposition, and some Conservative M.P.s speak with caution when the question of Protection is mentioned. The difficulties are becoming more real as the time for overcoming them approaches and faint hearts shrink from the bold policy of the "wall of brass." The Conservative papers are silent, while the Reform papers taunt the party in power with fear. Well, to us the issue appears clear. The late elections hinged upon the question of Protection or Free Trade; Protection won; and if Protection is not given there will be no honourable course left to Sir John A. Macdonald but to resign. It would be treachery to refuse Protection now. All the polished subtlety of the Premier could not explain away so direct a deceit. To deny Protection would be to proclaim Sir John A. Macdonald and every man who advocated it, and who now could be betrayed into saying it was "impossible"—would be to proclaim them all knaves or fools. Party politics may be induced to follow my leader wherever he may go and whatever he may do, but we are satisfied that there are enough of men of independent character in the Conservative ranks to see that the people will not be duped, and who will insist on the full measure of that Protection which was promised to the country on and before the general elections. The necessity for Protection has been established; the country responded with no uncertain sound, and we hope to see the result justify the deed. France, Germany, Belgium and the United States are prospering under Protection, and Canada can do the same. Make our people self-reliant, encourage them to make all that can be made in the country, let them manufacture their own material; let, or Sir John A. Macdonald hesitates, let some one else take his place, and carry the Protection policy to a successful end.

Fowl and Cattle Exports.

Canada now exports large numbers of geese and turkeys to England. As an experiment it appears, too, that this new exportation has been a great success. Thus a new field for Canadian enterprise is opened, and we may expect that the exportation of fowl, like the exportation of cattle and eggs, will become a regular business between Canada and Great Britain. We learn from a contemporary that—

The prices realized were, at first, from ninepence to tenpence per pound, but afterwards, when the prime quality of the poultry became known, the price went up to one shilling and one shilling and twopence per pound. These latter prices are, it must be confessed, very good, and such as to encourage larger shipments another season. From a private correspondent in England, who has some practical knowledge of the poultry market, we learn that the demand would be almost unlimited for both Canadian turkeys and geese, providing that well-nourished and well-conditioned birds could always be depended upon. This, he says, is a matter of the most vital importance to successful trade, and shippers cannot be too careful in selecting, packing and forwarding their stock. If these matters are properly attended to, he has no doubt but that there could be a trade built up which would be mutually satisfactory to all parties concerned—to the raisers and shippers here, and the buyers and consumers in England. We also notice that the sales of Canadian cattle and sheep in the English markets have been very large. In one instance it is stated that 30,000 sheep and 1,600 cattle were sold—the former averaging 150 lbs. weight, and realizing \$12 per head, the latter averaging 1,400 lbs. weight, and realizing \$132 per head. These prices, too, would seem to be very good, and to encourage the extension of the trade. By various newspaper accounts which have appeared within the last few months, it would seem that the exports have not equalled the demand of the markets, and it has been very freely suggested that Canadian farmers should go more extensively into the raising and feeding of stock. Of course, this is a question of profit and loss, and of whether it will pay the farming community, generally, to raise beef and mutton at 3 to 4 cents per pound, or such price as may be paid by the shippers at Montreal. It is generally believed that the prospects of a good and profitable trade in live cattle and sheep are encouraging; but it is admitted that it will be necessary, in order to take full advantage of the opportunities, for the farmers to go more generally into the raising of improved stock.

How the Truth Leaks Out.

It is not long since we caught the *Globe* tripping on the Home Rule question. We proved, from its own reasoning, that it must be in favor of Home Rule. It did not intend that it should be considered so, but it spoke the truth manfully, and confessed, by implication, that Home Rule was necessary and just. And now the Duke of Manchester has been committing himself in a somewhat similar way. It is "ever thus" with the antagonists of Irish National autonomy when they speak unguardedly. Here is how the Duke of Manchester commits himself. Speaking of the subject of having representation of the Colonies in the British House of Commons, he is reported to have said—

But there are serious objections to this course. The House of Commons is already, probably, as numerous as it ought to be, so that representatives from the Colonies could not be admitted in large numbers. In small numbers they would be swamped, and have no weight. The House of Commons is overwhelmed with business. If it discusses Imperial questions it has to neglect the more domestic interests of its constituents. "As numerous as it ought to be," "small numbers would be swamped," "overwhelmed with business" and "if it discusses Imperial questions it has to neglect the more domestic interests of its constituents." These are precisely the arguments that the Home Rulers use. They say that the House of Commons has too much to do, and the Home Rulers ask to relieve the overworked House of Commons of the Irish portion of the business. Why should Englishmen give the time which should be given to the interests of their constituents to discussing purely Irish questions, the Land Laws, Education, the reclamation of waste lands, the police and all the other questions which are of a purely Irish character. Upon this point the Duke of Manchester agrees with the Home Rulers. Then he says that, "in small numbers, the representatives from the colonies would be swamped." Here, again, the Duke of Manchester and the Home Rulers agree. "In small numbers" the Irish people are "swamped," and "they have no weight" against the odds which are opposed to them. The Irish party goes one way and the English party goes another, and the consequences are easily seen.

Home Rule.

How little the world appears to understand the Irish character. The other day we heard that "Home Rule was dead." To-day we learn that it is as much alive as ever it was, and that it is reorganizing. And this is the history of Irish movements for centuries. They are, we are assured, "dead" one day, and the next they come forth as fresh and as undying as "the chosen leaf" which is emblematic of the land. Irishmen understand this kind of thing well, but it is hard to drive it into the heads of men who are not Irish. After each defeat we always hear of the "last" Irish effort for Legislative Independence. When the Union was carried by making fifty-five peers and bribing to the extent of three millions sterling, the English press declared that Ireland was West Britonized for ever! And the echo of the words had scarcely died away when Fitzgerald, Emmet, Peto, and hosts of Protestant and Catholic patriots threw their swords into the scale and resolved to die as freemen rather than live as slaves. In such a day a "rebel" was a glorious name, for by that title men were known.

Well, the rebellion was crushed in the end, and again the cry went out, "Ireland can never make another struggle." Time went on and Catholic Bismarckianism was granted, and this it was considered forever settled the Irish difficulty. Ireland, it was said, should be satisfied, and yet only a few years ago past when the Young Irelanders fell into line, and the best blood in Ireland was gathered into its ranks. The movement collapsed, it is true, but the people were true to the one object, Home Rule in some form. O'Connell moved the country from end to end and failed to obtain repeal, and again we heard that the Irish difficulty (this time was in reality at an end). The famine decimated the country; O'Connell died unsuccessful, and once more the cry was raised—"Thank God, Irish agitation is at an end." But they were mistaken. Only a few years pass when the Fenians come upon the scene. They fail, and then the most sensible of all movements—"Home Rule"—agitates the country. It is proclaimed "dead," and here it comes reborn in its arms and

determined to carry on the struggle of winning Irish liberty by calm reason, and within the limits of the constitution. Home Rule may die, but it will be succeeded by some other movement, just as certain as all Irish agitations have their successors in the order of the affairs. Ireland has been robbed, openly and violently robbed of her Parliament, and until reparation for that robbery is made by Restoration, Irish agitation cannot cease. Men who understand the Irish character know this, and we hope that England will some day see the necessity and the justice of doing to Ireland as she would have Ireland do to her, if the order of affairs was reversed.

Caught Again.

We have, as a rule, something better to do than to be constantly exposing what we may call the speculative mistakes of the *Witness*. We regret that we are obliged to use so harsh a term, but there is none other that will meet the vague charges made by our contemporary. That the *Witness* would willfully tell a lie we do not believe; but that it would, as does, indulge in speculative charges, is too plain. It was only the other day we exposed the *Witness* on the church bazaar question, and now it leaves itself open to another exposure on the Orange question. The *Witness* had become so accustomed to immunity from reply to its attacks that it was never over-cautious. It said what it pleased, and calmly after calmly were flung around, and a gaping public too often swallowed them wholesale. But let us see what is the latest mistake made by our contemporary. Writing of the state of crime in Ireland, the *Witness* says there is less proportionate crime in Ulster than there is in any of the other provinces of Ireland. From this it argues that it is because of the presence of Orangemen in Ulster. Orangemen is thus calculated to improve society, keep down crime and raise the tone and temper of any community in which it exists. Orangeism is, according to the *Witness*, good for the world at large. Now, this being so, how does it happen that there is more proportionate crime in Ontario than Quebec? Come, now, sanctimonious contemporary of Bonaventure street, account for the logic of your ways. Orangeism is antagonistic to crime in Ireland! Why is it not antagonistic to crime in Ontario? Proportionately, there is more crime in the Upper Province than there is here, and yet in the one there are a great many Orangemen, while in the other there are very few. How will the *Witness* account for that? We do not say that it is because one is more Catholic or one more Protestant than the other. We do not reason from religious issues, and it could only occur to a mind framed for mischief, such as the *Witness* too often exhibits evidence of, that such an issue would be raised at all. Why must this eternal religious issue be raised when there is no occasion for it? Why must dissonant and poisoned locks in every passing breeze, and through the columns of the *Witness*, poison the atmosphere with inventions of its own? Why, but because it appears to be the mission of the *Witness* to do all the harm it can; to keep harping about "religion," when we venture to bet, two to one, that there is no more "religion" on its staff from the editor-in-chief to the printer's devil, than there is on the staff of any other journal. But there is one thing the *Witness* excels at, and in that none of its contemporaries can hold a candle to it, and that is—Hypocrisy. We can understand in times of excitement a wayward word or an accidental phrase which may be calculated to offend, but the *Witness* keeps at it—ding-dong—the religious issue all the year round. This is not the way to bring about peace! These are not the means by which a good feeling will be cultivated, and if our contemporary is sincere in its desire to see peace in Montreal it will leave religious issues to—the Pulpits.

Independence in Politics.

We are glad to notice that the *Irish Canadian* has thrown the Conservative party overboard, and that it has proclaimed itself Independent in politics. The *Irish Canadian* has been a faithful friend to the Irish people of Canada. Like all journals, at times it made its mistakes. It is the fate of all public men and of all public journals to offend even their own, sometime, but take it all in all, the *Irish Canadian* has championed the interest of the Irish people of the Dominion with faithful consistency. It championed the Reformers until it saw that the Reformers treated the Irish people with injustice; then it changed and championed Conservatism until now it sees the Conservatives use our people and then cast them aside. If we are right, the *Irish Canadian* has wearied of both parties, and has, like the Post, cast both of them where physics ought to go—to the dogs. This is the true policy at present. Ten years hence this policy may or may not be wise; but to-day it is the only policy that is calculated to make both parties fear our influence and dislike us because we are "unreliable." Well, let them dislike away. Who cares? When we make our influence felt both parties will discover our good qualities. It is all nonsense to say we must be tied to this party or that party before we can command any weight. We can only be tied to the party that proves itself our best friend. The Irish Catholics, as a whole, are like every other party—up for the highest bidder. Who does the most for them should have their support. As a rule, it is only men who look for individual gain that swear by either sides. Some men may be Reformers or Conservatives from principle sake, and stand faithful by their party; but take the majority of men, particularly the leaders, and individual gain is at the bottom of their "fidelity." Any man who makes money for himself, or any man who makes money for others, by pandering to either party, is a subject of suspicion. Take the case of the *Irish Canadian*. That paper was Conservative before the elections. The Conservatives won, and by abandoning the Conservative party the proprietor of the *Irish Canadian* abandons a standing income, in the shape of Government patronage, and prefers to tell the Conservatives that because of their treachery to his friends he casts them away. This is Independence in politics, and this is the policy which will, more than anything else, tend to elevate the influence and consolidate the power of a people who have been, nay, who are, used by both parties, and done justice to by neither. Nor does this policy confine itself to the Irish Catholics. It appears to us that any man who is not looking to self-interest must be more or less Independent in politics. It is to men who are Independent in politics that most political changes are due. What caused the great majority which the Reformers had five years ago, to be changed into as great a majority for the Conservatives to-day? What but the votes of men who cared for neither party, who voted as they thought right, because they were Independent in politics. Such men are the country's hope—men who think and act for themselves, and who decline to be tied to the cart-tail of either Sir John A. Macdonald's chariot or to the Hon. Mr. Mackenzie's bob-sleigh.

The Volunteer Militia.

A morning contemporary differs with some of our remarks on the Volunteer Militia. In the first place, it says that our wholesale condemnation of the country battalions is not deserved. It says that the "Woodstock, Elgin and Middlesex corps" would take no second rank with the cracks of the cities. We doubt it. In fact, we do not credit it. If so, why had we none of these "crack" corps in Montreal on the 24th of May last? And more; we have the word of a gentleman who knows the three corps referred to well, and who says that it is sheer nonsense to talk of any of them being equal to the worst of the city battalions in Quebec, Toronto, Ottawa or Montreal. The men are mostly farmers' sons, who never drill but during a few days in the year, and whose appearance on parade had better be not spoken about at all. Country battalions never have, and under the present system never can hope to be, "second to none" of the "crack" corps. The city corps drill all the year round, there is emulation in tidiness and precision, in which the country battalions are deficient. There is a great deal of difference between a city battalion of Volunteers and a country battalion, as anyone who saw the country battalions we had in Montreal last summer can testify. The money spent on most of the country battalions is money thrown away, and the fact that none of them are ever seen or heard from, unless at their annual drill, is some proof of it. Again, our contemporary says that we are "all astray as regards our closely copied the English volunteer system. It is a great pity that such was not the case, for then each corps would have a 'regular' Adjutant attached to it for five years, as is the case now in England." To such a proposition the Canadian Volunteer Militia would, we believe, object. If Canada cannot produce Adjutants from the ranks of its Volunteer militia after an existence of sixteen years, then the whole system is as rotten as a pear. We want paid Adjutants, but we want to see them taken from Canada and not from England. The Post and the *True Witness* has advocated the appointment of paid Adjutants more persistently than perhaps any paper in Canada, but those Adjutants should be trained to their duties here, and taken from the ranks of the Canadian Volunteers. It is in the method of forming the English militia that we too closely copied the English system. Country battalions were organized on the same basis as in England, but the authorities stopped short, where they should have begun by appointing paid Adjutants. They made the shell, but they gave it no kernel. Paid Adjutants should have been appointed first, and the battalions would soon fall into line, but instead of doing that the English system of getting the men together was adopted, but the English system of keeping the men together was neglected. Again, our contemporary says that the English Volunteers are "as liable to be called out for the suppression of riots, &c., as the Canadian forces, and would be called out were there no 'regular' troops to perform the service." Undoubtedly, they are just as liable to be called out as the Canadian Volunteers; but they are never wanted. If wanted, they would be obliged to go; but the "regular" troops and the police have been always found sufficient, and we do not remember a single instance in which the English Volunteers were called out to suppress a riot. They may have been so used, but we do not remember it. Once more our contemporary says that if we "had ever attended any of the autumn manœuvres, and seen such corps as the 'London Scottish,' the 'Inns of Courts,' 'Tower Hamlets,' 'London Irish,' 'East Kent,' going through their work brigaded with the 'regulars,' we would not have written that the English volunteers were for show, not for use." We have seen all these, and ten times more. There were no autumn manœuvres or great gatherings of Volunteers between '71 and '76 which we have not attended, and there have been no events of great importance to the Volunteers which we think have escaped our memory, and yet we repeat that the English Volunteers are more for show than for use. And this is how we prove it. What use have the English Volunteers ever been put to? They have infused a military spirit; they form a splendid and a necessary citizen army. They may be, but they have not yet proved themselves, to be useful. They have done good no doubt; but to say that they are absolutely useful is to speak fiction. The Canadian Volunteers have done more useful work in one week than the English Volunteers have done since the date of their formation. The English Volunteers were ready, but, fortunately, they were not wanted. And does not our contemporary see the mistake it makes in quoting the "London Scottish," "Inns of Court," "Tower Hamlets," "London Irish," and "East Kent"? Why cannot we hear the names of some famous country battalions? The corps quoted by our contemporary are city corps, thus, according to our contemporary, proving that even in England the city battalions are the best! The country battalions are, no doubt, capable of being made just as good as the city corps, but the experience of all men who know anything about them is, that they have neither the time, nor the opportunity necessary, to do so; that the officers will not spend the money; that the men never look as neat, and that notwithstanding that they cost as much as city corps, that they do no work, and as they are organized in Canada they are, in the most part, an incubus and a mistake.

CORRESPONDENCE.

TWO MORE LETTERS FROM "G."

The Jesuits and Their Calumniators.

To the Editor of the TRUE WITNESS and POST.
Sir,—In my last I spoke of the efforts of conspirators to introduce the pretended Reformation into France, and the bloodshed and anarchy which thence ensued. A handful of traitors, with Coligny at their head, ravaged their country, spurred on by ambition and hate. When a certain class of Protestant writers treat of those times and their natural result—the State vengeance of St. Bartholomew's Day, they described Coligny and his co-rebels as if they had exhausted all the virtues, and that France ungratefully struck her best friends when she cut them off. Now, I have read the history of those times differently, and I fear not to say that the supreme authority of the State, the power of the sword, was never more justly employed than in stopping the fanatics of murder, sedition and anarchy, and freeing France from her bitterest and most relentless foes. Had Protestant England been cursed with a party of abandoned, lawless Catholics, as Catholic France was with the brigands who called Coligny Chief, she would have hanged, drawn and quartered them in a week.

But this, by the way. Besides the Huguenot atmosphere of the court, the Jesuits when they arrived at Paris had to contend with a class of courtier ecclesiastics, who were the grief of the church and the disgrace of the calling. These unworthy churchmen were, ordinarily cadets of aristocratic houses; too

cowardly to succeed in war—too stupid for diplomacy—too poor to gratify their luxurious tastes as do-nothing laymen. They thrust themselves into the church to gain benefices, and when the ruler gratified their vanity and avarice, they repaid him by the meanest servility to the royal whims no matter how much they might be opposed to truth, justice and honor. They stooped to gain the ear of a royal mistress or a degraded eunuch in order to push their fortunes, and were not ashamed to boast their influence with a Pompadour or a du Barri. Those brazen blackguards, without faith, religion or God, ruled the King through his passions, and the courtiers, lay and cleric, were, in general, as bad as themselves. Now, the whole race of Valois, with hardly an exception, were utterly indifferent to religion, for their vices blinded them to the temporal and eternal consequences of crime. The cynical blasphemy of those times is well illustrated by the remark of a vicious old nobleman on his death-bed. When warned that his hours were numbered and that he should think of his soul, the wretched old sinner said: "God will think twice before he damns a nobleman of my position!"

But, if the loose principles of the court and courtiers had been confined to the palace, their effects would not have been so deplorable. The King desired to make a mere tool and slave of the State, just as Henry VIII. and Elizabeth of England compelled the Establishment to the meanest subservience to their whims and tyrannical caprice. The most worthless rulers of France were just those who, with the greatest impudence, the immutable moral sovereignty of the Catholic Church. You cannot pick out one man from among those kings with morals superior to the *Thermes* of ancient Rome. As the courtiers fashioned their moral as well as physical countenance to the visage of the monarch, and as they exercised a certain influence upon those below them, they soon arose in France a party which, though not formally heretical, was nevertheless a scandal to Christendom and a reproach to religion. They were called Gallicans, and the logical tendencies of their principles are exemplified perfectly to-day by the policy of Prince Bismarck. They wanted to tie the hands of the Sovereign Pontiff—to restrict his supreme jurisdiction—to make him the obedient servant of Caesar, and to subject the decisions of the Holy See to the petty court theologians of Paris. Even the great Bossuet, to whom I do not refer in any previous observations, was entangled by the insidious spirit of Gallicism, and grieved the Church of which he had ever been so consummate, so glorious a champion. The nobles loved Gallicism, because the intrepid vicars of Jesus Christ defended the poor against their abominable tyranny and ever strove to elevate the masses to the dignity of freemen without infringing upon the just rights of the nobles. Hence, the Parliament, wholly composed of the privileged class, was adverse from countenancing any principle or practice that would disturb the calm uniformity of despotism and caste privilege.

The King had successfully encroached upon many rights of the Holy See—the courtier clergy saw their only safety from canonical penalties in a hearty upholding of the royal pretensions—the nobles of Parliament considered their interests bound up with those of the monarch, the only liberty they demanded being the simple freedom to do as they pleased—and each idea of the ruling class considered the people as merely marionettes and puppets to dance attendance upon its pleasures and passions. This state of things grew more intolerable the more the benign influence of the true Catholic spirit was weakened, and both kings and courtiers acted as if this world had been created for aristocracy alone, forgetting, fools that they were! that there can be no real aristocracy apart from an independent, contented and prosperous peasantry.

At this juncture the Jesuits appeared in France. They came, breathing the purest Catholic spirit of devotion towards Rome and the august head of the Church on earth. They came, the champions of Catholicity, against the conflicting sects of Protestantism. They came devoted to virtue, truth, Christian education as against the paganized ideas of the times of Leo X. They came, detached from the world by the vow of poverty—from the flesh by the vow of chastity—from pride and self-will by the vow of obedience. They moreover vowed to reject, to despise the honors and emoluments so eagerly sought for by men imbued with the spirit of the world, and thus held themselves ever ready to combat for God and His Church—the indomitable force of Christianity in France. They were received in France somewhat favorably at first, but as the spirit of heresy began to spread among courtiers, the rich and powerful, the great Order became the mark for the most deadly hatred, the most infamous intrigue, the blackest calumny. Heresy instinctively felt that the Jesuits were its most formidable foe. It feared while it hated, and he who possesses the least knowledge of human nature will admit that the union of two such passions leads to the most vindictive results.

The King feared for his usurped privilege; the courtier clergy for their simoniacal benefices, the pluralities and sinecures; the Parliament for its *petitiois*, its crushing exactions, its revenue farming, its unbounded license, its spoliation of the people; the nobles, in general, for their oppressive privileges and titular claims—their traditional cruelty and lust; the Gallicans, the exposure of their treacherous and faith and incipient schism; the Huguenots, the frustration of that financial conspiracy against the faith and tranquillity of the French people. Already the sonorous voice of the Jesuit orator began to be heard warning rulers and nobles that God was no respecter of persons, and that peoples may be ruled by justice and equity, not by passion and arbitrary will. The courtier clergy saw the best of their order creeping fearfully into monasteries to do penance in sackcloth and ashes, for their sacrilegious lives. The Gallicans and Huguenots saw their keenest weapons of argumentation turned against themselves, and resolved in the bitterness of their defeat to be revenged. The suffering people heard, with gratitude, astonishment and joy, the Jesuits proclaim before the face of a tyrant that the poor had rights which kings and nobles were obliged, before God and man, to respect. Kings and nobles raged and threatened, and disregarded the voice of truth. Had they listened, the Reign of Terror, Wacker, Louis, Saladin, and the Radical Republic would never have been.

But enough for the present.

The Jesuits' Enemies.

To the Editor of the TRUE WITNESS and POST.
The *Witness* is the evangelical exponent of that class of literature which, once all the rage, is now disappearing before the impartial investigator and better knowledge of our time. Here and there it still lingers, making its existence felt by maledictory exclamations, which disgust honest men. Ten thousand virtues are passed over to find a vice, and the dark spot in the sun is exaggerated and widened until it hides the orb of day's most glorious rays.