

THE TRUE WITNESS IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY The Post Printing & Publishing Co. AT THEIR OFFICES: 761 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada.

Subscription, per annum... \$1.50 If paid strictly in advance... \$1.00

TO ADVERTISERS. A limited number of advertisements of approved character will be inserted in THE TRUE WITNESS at 15c per line (square), first insertion, 10c per line each subsequent insertion. Special Notices 50c per line. Special rates for contracts on application. Advertisements for Teachers, Information Wanted, &c., 50c per insertion (not to exceed 10 lines). Ordinary notices of Births, Deaths and Marriages 50c each insertion.

The large and increasing circulation of THE TRUE WITNESS makes it the best advertising medium in Canada.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.

Subscribers in the country should always give the name of their Post Office. Those who remove should give the name of the old as well as the new Post Office. Remittances can be safely made by Registered Letter Post Office Order. All notices will be acknowledged by changing the date on the address label attached to paper. Subscribers will see by date on the address label when their subscription expires. Sample copies sent free on application. Parties wishing to become subscribers can do so through any responsible news agent, when there is none of our local agents in their locality. Address all communications to

The Post Printing & Publishing Co.

NO DISCOUNT FROM THE REGULAR SUBSCRIPTION PRICE OF \$1.50 PER ANNUM WILL BE ALLOWED IN ANY CASE EXCEPT WHEN PAYMENT IS MADE ABSOLUTELY IN ADVANCE, OR WITHIN 30 DAYS OF COMMENCEMENT OF SUBSCRIPTION.

WEDNESDAY... APRIL 29, 1885

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

We have sent out a large number of bills to subscribers in arrears, and up to date the returns have not been as large as they should be. As a newspaper, no more than any other business, can be run on an empty treasury, we earnestly trust that all our patrons receiving these bills will make it a point to pay off their indebtedness to THE TRUE WITNESS without delay. THE TRUE WITNESS is an exceedingly cheap paper, the subscription price (when paid in advance) being only one dollar. The amount due by each one is, accordingly, very small; but the aggregate of these trifling sums reaches a figure far up in the thousands. And these thousands are absolutely required to give each reader a bright, live, instructive and entertaining newspaper such as THE TRUE WITNESS is to-day. We say so, without any boasting, to which our readers will readily admit we are not very largely given. THE TRUE WITNESS stands on its merits, and these entitle it to the first place in the ranks of Catholic journalism in Canada. This distinction it has achieved through the aid of the Montreal DAILY POST, the only Irish Catholic daily in America. We have succeeded in furnishing to our people a paper that is creditable to them as well as to ourselves; we are engaged in fighting their battles, and it is only right and fair that we should meet with their generous cooperation. This co-operation can be rendered doubly effective by each subscriber settling his or her indebtedness and by each one securing a new reader and subscriber for the paper. In that way the usefulness of THE TRUE WITNESS will be increased and the public will be sure to receive greater benefits from its prosperity and progress.

Mr. Justice Johnson, in commenting on the verdict rendered by a jury in the case of the Canada Shipping Company against the Toronto Mail for libel, delivered himself of an original and witty remark. The libel was a most damaging one to the company, but the jury's verdict, which was in its favor, awarded only the small sum of \$25 damages. The worthy Judge concluded, from the insignificance of the award, that the verdict could only be interpreted as a declaration by the jury of their opinion that the newspapers of the country were so conducted as to make it a matter of indifference what they said as to a person or corporation, nobody being influenced against the attacked by these efforts of the press. "The fact is," said His Honor, "that the press in this country has sunk so low that nobody cares what it says, and it doesn't make a bit of difference what its opinions are." Is the Judge right?

According to a special cable despatch, the Marquis of Ripon and Lord Rosebery are the two hot favorites for the succession to Earl Spencer as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. It is asserted that the Marquis of Ripon would be the more acceptable to the Irish people on account of his religion, which, however, forms a disability to his taking the office, and would have to be removed by act of Parliament. This idea of Ireland being reduced to silence and of being willing to accept an intolerable situation, if the Viceroy was only a Catholic is an altogether mistaken one. Ireland, a Catholic country, chooses a protestant to be her leader. The Irish people will not and do not allow a man's religion to interfere or obstruct the legitimate advance of the national cause. Speaking on this subject, the London

Universal remarks that some of the political quacks, who are always ready to prescribe their nostrums for the cure of Irish discontent, now say that the one thing the country wants is a Catholic Lord-Lieutenant. If the Marquis of Ripon were to be made Viceroy nature would smile, the pigs grow fat, and the potatoes would be round and mealy. Before a Catholic could be installed in Dublin Castle an Act of Parliament repealing a remnant of the penal persecutions should have to be passed, that is to say, removing the disability which hinders a man of our creed from holding the position. That Act should be passed, and must be passed whenever Irishmen choose to demand it. But that a Catholic viceroy would pacify Ireland is the purest balderdash. The Church is more independent there in literal actuality than in most ostensibly Catholic countries of the Continent. And the grievances against which the Ireland of the present protests are not so much religious as national, practical, and worldly.

Mr. Gladstone brought up the subject of the vote of credit for fifty-five million dollars, and, in a powerful and warlike speech, asked the House to vote the entire sum en bloc. It was at first thought that half of this vote of credit would go towards paying off the expenses of the Soudan campaign; but the Premier surprised the House by explaining that the Government did not intend to devote any portion of the money for Soudan purposes, but would reserve discretion to apply the whole vote for "purposes of special preparations," which, in other terms, means for war with Russia. The entire credit was voted without debate. Evidently the struggle is going to assume wide proportions and will be a costly item in the Budget. To meet this first war credit, the income tax, which is essentially a war tax, will receive an accession of about sixpence in the pound. This tax at the present moment is only sixpence in the pound, but to meet the revenue deficit it is expected Right Hon. Hugh Childers, Chancellor of the Exchequer, when he brings down his budget, will ask for twopence, bringing the rate up to eightpence, which, with the extra sixpence for war purposes, will make the total tax one shilling and twopence. This was only equalled once (in 1855, Russian war period), since 1843, and only surpassed once since the same date, in 1857 (Indian mutiny), when the tax was one shilling and fourpence. During Earl Beaconsfield's second Administration in the years 1875 and 1876, the tax found its lowest mark, being only two pence in the pound. Evidently, if an Anglo-Russian war takes place, Great Britain is not going to be a cheap country to live in for some years to come.

The Philadelphia American writes rather disdainfully of Canada in the matter of the fisheries question, which it considers to be the one problem that gives Canadians a share in the high politics of the world. Our contemporary feels nettled over the prospect of having American fishermen excluded from the fat fishing grounds in and around the Gulf of St. Lawrence after the 1st of July next, when the Washington treaty will expire. The American says there is no intention to renew the fishery clauses on a basis that would give Canadians a guinea a pound for all the fish the Americans would take, and then admit Canadian fish free of duty into United States ports. Our contemporary reminds us that the Government at Washington have another power than Canada to deal with in any further negotiations, and says:—"Canada has no more power to shut us out of the Gulf of St. Lawrence than out of Bristol Bay. The Gulf of St. Lawrence is British water, not Canadian. Our rights to fish in it will be settled in London, and not in Ottawa. And the concessions made to us, as in the settlement of the Fortune Bay outrages,—will be determined by the consideration of how much England desires at that moment to keep us in good humor. And unless all the signs of the political weather are delusive, England will have much need for our good will both before and after the first day of July. Canada cannot cut her cake and have it. She cannot hang on to an European Empire and enjoy the facilities furnished by its military and diplomatic system, and then strut about with the airs of an independent country. She may cut "the silken rosin" as soon as she likes, and we will deal with her as a nation. But so long as she wears it, she is to us merely an outlying province of the British Empire, and our dealings with her interests are but a part of our diplomatic relations with that Empire." This is hard on Canada, but it is only what it must expect as long as it continues in the role of a mental appendage.

THE ONTARIO MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

From the annual report just published we are pleased to find that this popular life company has experienced another year of great prosperity, having issued 1820 new policies in 1884 for \$2,423,200. As compared with the previous year this shows an increase of 282 in the number of policies and \$378,600 in the amount assured. The total number of policies in force at the close of 1884 is 6,086, covering assurances for the sum of \$7,835,900.71. The cash income also shows a gratifying growth, having increased from \$199,182.00 in 1883 to \$260,939.68 in 1884, while the assets of the company have advanced from \$533,705.55 in 1883 to \$652,661.68 in 1884, showing a net gain during the year of no less a sum than \$118,956.21. These figures speak for themselves with "no uncertain sound," and prove beyond question that the Ontario is not only a vigorous and progressive company, but that the management of its affairs is in the hands of able, prudent and experienced men. We have, therefore, great pleasure to repeat our recommendation of last year to any

of our readers who may need insurance on their lives, that they cannot do better than give the Ontario a share of their business, being satisfied that the company is sound in every respect, its development healthy, its plans of assurance attractive, and its dealing with its members liberal. The Ontario, we have reason to believe, is in every way worthy of public patronage.

GRENADIER NELSON AND THE SIXTY-FIFTH.

OUTSIDE of the massacres, the most painful and disgusting feature of the North-West campaign is undoubtedly the monstrous charges against the gallant 65th of Montreal, which were published by the Toronto News and alleged to have been made by Sergeant Nelson of the Grenadiers. The charges, on their face, are iniquitous lies, and the conduct of the News in giving them currency is reprehensible in the extreme. It has managed to get up a sensation, but at the expense of the national honor and dignity. Sergeant Nelson's whole tirade is nothing but an expression of bitter hatred of a brave and honorable race. His allusion to the 65th as "infernal Frenchmen" betrays the sentiments which filled his cowardly breast and moved his lying tongue. Some of the doings which he attributes to the officers and men of the battalion would dishonor even the meanest brutes of the animal creation and are unmentionable to polite ears. They are described by this Grenadier Nelson as a "mutinous," "reckless," "disorderly," "drunken," "filthy," "thieving" gang. The Minister of Militia should make it his immediate and imperative duty to punish and brand the atrocious calumniamer of the 65th and his no less vile accomplice, the Toronto News. Its gallant commander, Col. Ouimet, has written an open letter, in which he expresses his amazement at the scandalous and undeserved attack upon his regiment. He testifies to the fortitude and cheerfulness with which both officers and men bore the hardships of the journey, and says that he did not receive a single complaint, nor did he witness or hear even a trivial instance of misconduct. Col. Ouimet repels the charges with indignation, and demands that the Militia Department take immediate and official action in respect of them.

AMERICAN SYMPATHY.

The N. Y. Herald has a rather remarkable article dealing with the question, on which side will the United States throw its sympathies in case of a war between Great Britain and Russia? A few American journals urge that "blood is thicker than water and a community of language and literature calls for a community of feeling." They call for American sympathy with England. But the Herald answers that in doing so they mistake the real feelings of Americans, and bluntly avers that to it this cry about American sympathy with England seems "unmitigated bosh and rot." Our contemporary sees no instance in history where England has ever been notorious for her friendly and unselfish spirit towards other nations, but finds her spending her substance in vain endeavors to check the progress of younger nations.

The Herald considers that Russia is only fulfilling its role in pushing eastward and southeastward through Asia, owing to the momentum of its population and the inevitable operation of natural causes. Just as we of the United States have "moved westward, and having reached the Pacific will for the next century or two "extend ourselves northward and southward "until we cover the North American continent from Panama to the Pole."

This is rather a plain hint as to what is to become of the Dominion in the near future. A good many people were under the impression that the Union was not in need of Canadian territory and did not want it, but here is a rather startling insinuation of American designs with regard to Canada's destiny. The Herald concludes as follows:—"But there are facts in the case which are open to everybody. It is a fact that the extension of Russia across a large part of Asia has been and is an unmitigated benefit to modern civilization. She has acted, and is acting, as a pioneer in Asia as we have been the pioneers in North America. Wherever she has set her foot the seeds of civilization have been sown and have had a chance to sprout. Moreover, that Russia shall continue to expand is inevitable. If England were able to stop her southerly and southeasterly expansion, that would only force her to press upon Central Europe. If the English could drive Russia back across the Asiatic steppes, would she not thereby precipitate the Northern Giant upon Germany, Austria, France; and make real that dolorous presage of Napoleon's that a century all Europe might be Cossack? Finally, it would not be strange if Americans should have a warm feeling toward Russia. This is easily explained. Russia and the United States are the two young, vigorous, growing and expanding nations in Christendom; and the young think and feel alike. France, Germany and England are old and past their vigor. Germany, hemmed in on all sides, strives vainly to set up an artificial and sterile colonial system, based not on the enterprise of her people, which reaches out in other directions, but upon government plans, money and fleets. France impoverishes her people by expeditions to Tonquin. England spends her substance in vain endeavors to check the progress of younger nations. Russia and the United States alone march onward, peacefully fulfilling their destiny, expanding their young vigor in subduing barbarism, and spreading wherever they go the ideas and the implements of

civilization. England, crying out against this advance, and scheming and fighting to obstruct it, is like old Dame Partington ridiculously sweeping back the tide with her broom."

PECULIARITIES OF THE NEW FRANCHISE BILL.

The Dominion Franchise Bill, which is now before the House, is destined to meet with considerable opposition. This bill, no more than any other, is not perfect. It contains provisions which are quite debatable, and others that are exceedingly objectionable. The clauses dealing with the qualifications based on property and income are a matter of appreciation. The proposal to drag woman, and unprotected females at that, into the vortex of politics, is more gallant than wise or desirable. Female suffrage is sentimental rot of the worst description. It is not demanded by any respectable or large portion of the fair sex. It would be out of place in a sober franchise bill for this young Dominion. Then there is the establishment of the revising barrister, who will be supreme and infallible in his sway over the Canadian electorate. It shall be his business to prepare the voters' lists, and from these lists there is to be no appeal. He will have to decide the value of the property, and upon his decision depends the qualification of the voter, again without appeal. This supreme and infallible official is to hold office during good behaviour, and can only be removed for cause, so that to his supremacy and infallibility must be joined the attribute of immutability. Parliament will have to be very careful how it deals with that clause of the bill concerning the duties of this important personage. Finally, a consideration of importance is that regarding the expenses it will be necessary to incur in giving the bill effect. There has been some mention of the cost running up to about \$200,000 a year. The country evidently cannot afford to toy with such figures. Every precaution will have to be taken by Parliament against making the people pay too dearly for the right of the franchise. The basis of the new franchise bill is as follows:— It is proposed that voters in cities, towns and incorporated villages shall have the same qualifications. Every one who is twenty-one years old and is a British subject, and not otherwise disqualified, shall have a vote if he is the owner of real property to the value of \$300. Everyone who is a tenant in a city or town under a lease shall have a vote if his lease is at the annual rental of not less than \$20. Every occupant of real property other than owner or tenant, of the value of \$300, shall have a vote. Residents of such cities or towns deriving an income of not less than \$400 annually from some trade, calling, office or profession, or investment or charge on real property, shall have a vote. Sons of property holders, not otherwise qualified, who reside upon such property, when the value of the property is sufficiently large to qualify such son or sons, shall have a vote. In the counties, it is proposed that every person who is the owner of real property within any such electoral district of the value of \$150, or is tenant under lease of not less than a year, at an annual rental of not less than \$20 in money or in kind, shall have a vote. Occupants of property other than as owners or tenants of the value of \$150 can exercise the franchise. As in the cities so in the country districts, anyone who derives an income of not less than \$400, and is a resident a year, shall have a vote. Farmers' sons, not otherwise enfranchised, who are residents and have been so continually on their paternal acres, shall have a vote if the farm be of sufficient value that if divided among them they would be qualified under the Act. Sons of owners of property, other than farmers, and resident thereon, when the property is of sufficient value to qualify them, shall have a vote. Fishermen, the owners of real property and boats and tackle, which together are of the value of \$150, shall also have a vote. By these provisions the basis of suffrage will be somewhat broadened in a few of the provinces, while in others it will be narrowed. This is to be regretted, for we believe the broader the franchise the better for the country. Citizenship, residence and intelligence should be the only requisite qualifications to enjoy the rights of the franchise. Some people talk about the possession of real estate being necessary to prove a man has a stake in the welfare of the country. Nothing more flimsy and untenable than that! Who to-day are the very back-bone and defence of the Confederation but young men, the majority of whom own neither real estate nor pay rent, and whose incomes are not up to the required standard. And still this is the class of people who are disfranchised for the insulting reason that they have no stake in the country's welfare represented in so many dollars and cents. A citizen suffrage does more honor and renders more benefit to a country than a money suffrage.

It is proposed that voters in cities, towns and incorporated villages shall have the same qualifications. Every one who is twenty-one years old and is a British subject, and not otherwise disqualified, shall have a vote if he is the owner of real property to the value of \$300.

Everyone who is a tenant in a city or town under a lease shall have a vote if his lease is at the annual rental of not less than \$20.

Every occupant of real property other than owner or tenant, of the value of \$300, shall have a vote.

Residents of such cities or towns deriving an income of not less than \$400 annually from some trade, calling, office or profession, or investment or charge on real property, shall have a vote.

Sons of property holders, not otherwise qualified, who reside upon such property, when the value of the property is sufficiently large to qualify such son or sons, shall have a vote.

In the counties, it is proposed that every person who is the owner of real property within any such electoral district of the value of \$150, or is tenant under lease of not less than a year, at an annual rental of not less than \$20 in money or in kind, shall have a vote.

Occupants of property other than as owners or tenants of the value of \$150 can exercise the franchise.

As in the cities so in the country districts, anyone who derives an income of not less than \$400, and is a resident a year, shall have a vote.

Farmers' sons, not otherwise enfranchised, who are residents and have been so continually on their paternal acres, shall have a vote if the farm be of sufficient value that if divided among them they would be qualified under the Act.

Sons of owners of property, other than farmers, and resident thereon, when the property is of sufficient value to qualify them, shall have a vote.

Fishermen, the owners of real property and boats and tackle, which together are of the value of \$150, shall also have a vote.

By these provisions the basis of suffrage will be somewhat broadened in a few of the provinces, while in others it will be narrowed. This is to be regretted, for we believe the broader the franchise the better for the country. Citizenship, residence and intelligence should be the only requisite qualifications to enjoy the rights of the franchise.

Some people talk about the possession of real estate being necessary to prove a man has a stake in the welfare of the country. Nothing more flimsy and untenable than that! Who to-day are the very back-bone and defence of the Confederation but young men, the majority of whom own neither real estate nor pay rent, and whose incomes are not up to the required standard. And still this is the class of people who are disfranchised for the insulting reason that they have no stake in the country's welfare represented in so many dollars and cents. A citizen suffrage does more honor and renders more benefit to a country than a money suffrage.

ON THE VERGE OF WAR.

There has been a general disappointment over the text and tone of Mr. Gladstone's daily statements in the House of Commons concerning the Anglo-Russian dispute over the Afghan frontier. Every one expected that the Premier would state the immediate intentions of the Government, instead of finding excuses for delay and peace parleys while Russia was pushing her troops forward with feverish haste and capturing advantageous positions in the Afghan territory. But to-day the despatches indicate that Mr. Gladstone has almost definitely done with

peaceful explanations of the situation, and that while seeming to show a weak and shuffling hand, he has all along been preparing for the momentous struggle which is either to settle the fate of the Empire or to put a damper on Muscovite ambition for some time to come. The character and extent of these war preparations were guessed at when the immense credit which Mr. Gladstone has asked for is taken into consideration. His statement on the floor of the House, that the government feel it is necessary to hold all the resources of the Empire, including the forces in the Soudan, available for instant use whenever required, is a positive indication that England is on the verge of war. This declaration of the Premier narrows the controversy between London and St. Petersburg and leaves but little room for anything but a formal notice from one to the other that powder and shot must take the place of speech and pen in the settlement of the quarrel. A declaration of war will be in order before the lapse of forty-eight hours, if Russia does not give some sign of receding from her position or of abandoning her pretensions in some way.

HOW A CONTEMPORARY VIEWS THE SITUATION.

Our esteemed contemporary the Daily Witness entertains some queer notions and says some funny things about the role England plays in the world's history, contrasted with that of Russia. It says, for instance, that the question between the two great empires of the world is not who shall rule in India, but whether the Saxon or the Slav shall be the promoter or retarder of human progress. As far as promoting or retarding the progress of humanity is concerned, we think there is not much preference to be accorded either of the contending parties. How has England promoted human progress in countries with which she has had to deal? The only progress that the natives ever made was to get rid of their wealth and liberties, to be handed over to the British invader. What human progress did she promote in Ireland, or even in Scotland? What human progress did we have here in Canada until the patriots of '37 and '38 pulled the country out of the bonds of misgovernment and of national despair? Where is the human progress noticeable among the Egyptians, who are ble to the death by English capitalists? When did human progress begin to take a start in the United States? Not while under British protection.

What human progress has she promoted in India? No later than last year the British promoters of human progress kicked up a devil of a row because it was suggested that natives might be fit and proper persons to fill judicial positions in their own country. Russia can show no such record of having retarded human progress so persistently and so universally. The Witness is consequently somewhat out in its calculations regarding the object and the motives of the present struggle between the two empires. It is decidedly comical to hear the Witness gravely assert that "England is not a brute force, but a moral force." There is, however, some truth in the assertion, but then we must distinguish. It is quite true that England is a good deal of a moral force when she has a bigger bully than herself to deal with. She does not commence the "slugging" until all peace preliminaries are considered and all peaceful solutions of the question are exhausted. She only stands up against an antagonist equal to herself when she must. On the other hand, let her antagonist be inferior in strength, and all the moral force vanishes. What moral force characterizes her relations with Ireland? What was the force that suddenly drove the British fleet against Alexandria two years ago? Arabi was not as strong as Komaroff, and moral force was at a discount. England is a brute force every time she comes in contact with a weaker power, and the Daily Witness cannot change the fact by a simple assertion to the contrary.

"THE CLARITY OF SILENCE."

Just as we said—the stories sent over the cable, describing the reception of the Prince of Wales in Ireland were, from the first, colored beyond measure. The reports were cooked and manufactured by English scribes and by thoroughly anti-Irish press agencies. Seldom have the wires been made to carry such a mass of falsehood and misrepresentation as is concentrated in the despatches relating to the royal visit. The object of this stupid and unprofitable scheme was to make the outside world believe that Ireland was "loyal" to England and satisfied with English rule. But the scheme will prove as flat a failure as the royal visit itself. The truth was caged for ten days, but the Irish papers were neither suppressed nor muzzled, and the relation of the facts has at last come by mail. The visit of the Prince, as we have frequently pointed out, was especially inopportune under the auspices of Earl Spencer, who is odious to the Irish people, and at a period when a coercion code suppresses the liberties of the nation. And above all was the visit undesirable from the fact that it would be made use of by the two English parties to misrepresent the opinions of the Irish people. Thus the people, by their divided action, choosing between cordiality towards the heir to the Throne and attachment to the cause of Irish nationality. To a people who want freedom and a just government there could be no hesitation as to a choice. Ireland made it wisely and well. Never in the long history of kings was royalty boycotted with such national unanimity and gazed at in such respectful silence by a nation as the Prince of Wales has been by Ireland. None were in attendance to pay court to His Royal Highness but Castle officials and parasites, and

ascendancy factionists. The heart and bulk of the nation were present neither in person nor in spirit.

The people's representatives, religious, political and municipal, declined with stern dignity to mingle with royalty in the polluted chambers of Spencer's castle. The day the Prince reached Dublin, United Ireland, the organ of the National party, presented the Prince with a gigantic bouquet of representative Irish opinions of his visit, which were in striking contrast with the addresses drawn up by the limited Orange and Freeman lodges. That enterprising journal had sent circulars to the parliamentary representatives, to the bishops and clergy, to every mayor, Chairman of Town Commissioners or Chairman of Poor Law Boards, to influential private citizens, to societies, and to each of the 800 branches of the National League throughout the country, representing about 20,000 members, to ascertain what was thought of the Prince and his visit. The result was the most remarkable assemblage of individual and corporate opinions ever collected in a single paper. United Ireland published 38 long and closely printed columns of brief and pointed expressions of the popular mind, and want of space and time prevented it from publishing as many more. It was equal to a plébiscite of the whole population, and their verdict, given without the slightest preconcept, was that the Prince of Wales deserved nothing better from the Irish people than their silence. Speaking for the bishops and clergy of Ireland, Archbishop Croke sent the following in answer to the circular:—

"Were the Prince and Princess of Wales coming amongst us to restore our constitutional rights; to demolish Dublin Castle; to put an end to Orange ascendancy and freemason's rule; and, above all, to inaugurate an Irish Parliament in College Green, we should joyously strew flowers on their path and literally fill the air with the echo of their name. But coming, as we are regretfully forced to think they do, on no such ennobling or beneficent mission, and, indeed, for no clearly defined or useful purpose whatever, they can reasonably expect nothing from the oppressed people of Ireland but a dignified reserve and 'the charity of their silence.'"

—T. W. CROKE, Archbishop of Cashel. Speaking in the name of all Ireland, Mr. Parnell wrote that in view of the maladministration of affairs and of the despotic use of power of Earl Spencer, he failed to see "upon what ground it can be claimed from any lover of constitutional government that the Prince is entitled to a reception from the independent and patriotic people of Ireland, or to any recognition save from the garrison of officials, land owners and place-hunters, who fatten upon the poverty and misfortunes of the country." Through the whole spiritual and civil hierarchies the same sentiments were expressed, and thus by journalistic enterprise was it made plain to the Prince that the high jinks of funkycorn were not the voice of the nation, and that the bitter recollections of coercion rule, of want and oppression and of forced emigration, were not to be blotted out by a Royal show and progress through the land, nor to be compensated by a princely smile or by the wearing of a green bonnet.

In its editorial comments upon the reception to the Prince of Wales, the Dublin Freeman says, "the reception was remarkable, not for its enthusiasm, but for the absence of any demonstration of disapproval. The people properly so called, either remained away or looked on in silence; and the scene would not have failed to impress the Prince as lacking greatly the warmth with which he was welcomed in '68. The loud and hearty huzzas of the crowd, the hearty roar which the Prince would be glad to recognize as testifying the satisfaction of his subjects with the existing state of affairs—was nowhere heard. Unless you had it to seek to disguise this fact, it is a simple naked truth."

The Freeman concludes that it will be all the better for the Prince himself, and perhaps all the better for the future relations of the two countries if he realises the stern facts of the situation, and understands that nothing can convert Ireland from what she is to-day—a source of weakness and danger to the empire—into what she might be—an element of strength and safety—but the concession to the Irish people of the full right to manage their own affairs.

CATARHUS.—A new treatment has been discovered whereby this hitherto incurable disease is eradicated in from one to three applications, no matter whether standing one year or forty years. Descriptive pamphlets sent free on receipt of stamp. A. H. DIXON & SON, 205 King street west, Toronto, Canada. 20 ff.

RESOLUTIONS OF CONDOLENCE.

At a meeting of the Quebec Branch Irish National League, held in St. Patrick's Hall on the 19th inst., the following resolutions were carried unanimously:— Moved by Mr. J. C. Kaine, seconded by Mr. Chas. McCarron—Whereas the hand of Divine Providence has removed from our midst our late member, Mr. Francis McLaughlin, be it resolved,—That we deeply deplore the death of Mr. McLaughlin as a great loss to the Quebec Branch of the Irish National League, and to the cause of Irish nationality. That the Secretary be instructed to convey to the family of the deceased our sincere sympathy in their bereavement, and that copies of the above be inserted in THE MONTREAL POST, Irish Canadian, Savannah News and the local press. J. GALLAGHER, Secretary.

READ THIS

FOR COUGHS and COLDS there is nothing equal to DR. HARVEY'S SOUTHERN RED PINE. Every bottle of it is warranted and guaranteed, therefore, be returned if not found satisfactory. 48 ff.

THE CHURCH IN PRUSSIA.

BERLIN, April 23.—The lower part of the Prussian Landtag to-day rejected by 182 to 123 the proposal to repeal the law stopping the temporalities of the Catholic clergy. The motion to exempt from punishment priests who say mass and administer sacraments without authority was rejected by 169 to 127.

JEFF DAVIS' PARDON.

WASHINGTON, April 22.—Col. Horn, editor of the Meridian Mercury, was forwarded an application to President Cleveland for the pardon of Jeff Davis.