

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

Subscriptions, 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 the per line (square, first insertion, 100 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 very 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 or Post Office Order. All remittances 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 MARCH 9, 1887

SIR JOHN knew what he was about when he made parliamentary voting open and not by ballot in the North-West Territories. A horde of Government bullies, headed by Tom White, have gone there to see that the settlers and half-breeds vote for Ministerial candidates. And this is called a free country!

HOME RULE continues the burning question in English politics. It is proposed to hold simultaneous mass meetings throughout England to test popular feeling on the subject. The Tories talk of holding counter demonstrations. But this question must be settled, and it can only be settled in one way. Already it is Home Rule or No Rule, and big as the army of occupation now is, it will have to be doubled; yet even then government by coercion will be as difficult as ever.

CARDINAL GIBBONS' exposition of the character and objects of the Knights of Labor has, according to late cables, been favorably received at Rome. The order does not, it seems, come under the ban against secret societies. It may be observed that the Knights of Labor is an organization whose decisions and actions are generally well known to the public. There is really very little secrecy about them. It is different, however, with capitalists, who form rings and combinations of which the public can know nothing till after the operators have scooped their millions. This sort of secret society is worthy the attention of the Church.

VERY WISE, very diplomatic, indeed, is the tone and language adopted by the Conservative press towards the Nationalists. One organ says, with admirable candor, that Sir John will have no difficulty in buying them up when he wants them, and now the Quebec Chronicle patronizingly remarks:—"Sir John is magnanimous always. He will forgive and forgive. The Nationalists, therefore, may be regarded as safe for Sir John." How very kind! How amiable. What a dear, forgiving old Rooster Sir John must be! "Bless you, my children! Go and sin no more." But what if the Nationalists should think that, if there is any forgiving and forgetting to be done, it is theirs to do? Perhaps The Chronicle, in the exuberance of its generosity, forgot this view of the situation. We might further suggest that there is just a possibility that the Nationalists will not forgive and forget, in which case Sir John may have to reconsider the situation.

AN OTTAWA CORRESPONDENT relates that on the occasion of the torchlight procession, to celebrate the victory of the Tory candidates for that city, the Orange Young Britain band played "Croppies lie down," and other tunes insulting to Catholics. Yet among those who are prominently mentioned as taking part in the demonstration were such Irish Catholics as D. O'Connor and P. Baeker-ville, with "Captain" McCaffrey as grand marshal. The spectacle must have been highly edifying. From this we gather that the Tory victory at Ottawa is regarded as an Orange victory, a fact which Ottawa Catholics should know how to appreciate.

At the opening of the Ontario Legislature, Mr. Ewart, the new member for Prescott, in seconding the address in reply to the Lieut.-Governor's speech, very properly castigated the Conservative party for raising the cry against the French people and the Catholic Church. Commenting on Mr. Ewart's speech, Mr. Meredith, leader of the Opposition, attempted the antiquated Tory tu quoque argument with very poor success, but he managed in the course of his remarks to give a tolerably loud echo of The Mail's programme, which everybody knows is distinctly anti-Catholic. Among other things he said "the Liberals had a majority, not because their policy was endorsed by a majority of

"the people, but because a certain church had faltered against the Conservative party. Such talk as this is more deserving of ridicule than reprehension, and would not be worth noticing save as an indication that the Tories have made hostility to the Church a standing plank in their very narrow and shaky platform. Mr. Mowat's reply was the exact truth—the "no popery" cry had been raised by the Mail and the Conservative journals in Ontario, and that the cry was not repudiated till it was found the Conservatives were being injured. The Reformers had simply defended themselves against that cry.

We had hoped that the severe lesson taught by the Protestant people of Ontario to the instigators of religious discord would have put a stop to this foolish and dangerous business, but it seems we were mistaken and that the Tories still cherish sectarian animosity as a part of their policy. Very well. Let them go ahead and see what they will make of it.

HOME RULE PROTESTANTS.

Opponents of Home Rule have constantly endeavored to create and confirm the impression that the Nationalist movement was confined wholly to the Catholic population of Ireland. This is one of the darling assumptions of such writers as Goldwin Smith and such enemies of Irish freedom as the Orange delegates who visited America last fall. It is, however, purely gratuitous, for among the advocates of Home Rule there are to be found numbers of the ablest and best Protestant Irishmen living. We see by the reports in the Irish papers that the growth of Nationalism among the non-Catholic people has been steady and normal. To-day it is safe to say more than one-half of the Protestants, outside of the active circle of Ulster Orangemen, are Home Rulers. The Protestant Home Rule Association holds monthly meetings and distributes pamphlets to its subsidiary branches, and has accumulated a fund for relief and agitation purposes.

The work done by this association has been of immense benefit to the National cause and has done much to destroy the pretension of those who deserted Mr. Gladstone, namely, that the Protestants of Ireland were opposed to Home Rule.

At a recent meeting of this body in Dublin, Professor Swift McNeill, recently elected as a member of Parliament in South Donegal, enlightened the members on the great question before Parliament. Those who have been led to believe that all the strong, vehement and violent language used in the campaigns in Ireland came from Catholic and Land League throats should read the speech of this calm, deliberate scholar. The Catholic priests of Donegal, he said, had accompanied him (a Protestant and the son of a Protestant minister) on his tour of vote soliciting, and he wanted to go before English constituencies, into the very strongholds of the Liberal Unionists, and "nail the lie they had told about the country, to the effect that Protestants and Catholics would fly at each other's throats but for the benign interference of the followers of Lord Hartington." He denounced the government for its dishonest professions, for its packing of juries by the exclusion of Catholics, and declared that it was an insult to the respectable, conscientious Protestants to presume that they would always bring in a verdict to suit the purposes of the caste authorities, no matter how weak the case or how perjured and unreliable the witnesses.

Resolutions were passed at this meeting which declared that the present administration of the laws in Ireland is thoroughly unjust and calculated to alienate the moral support of the people, and to bring the executive authority into contempt. It has been observed that this declaration would have been impossible in a meeting of influential Protestants five years ago. But the fact only proves what has often been illustrated by events in the history of the Irish struggle—that the Protestant people of Ireland, outside the Orange Association, have ever sympathized with their Catholic fellow-countrymen, and frequently furnished the National cause with its most brilliant and devoted leaders.

EVICTIONS IN IRELAND.

Some interesting facts in connection with the landlords' war in Ireland are given in a return of the evictions during the quarter ending December 1st, lately published. In Leinster the total number of families evicted were 118, in Ulster 131, in Connaught 183, and in Munster 218, or 650 families in all. The number of persons embraced in this total was 3,369.

It has often been observed that evictions and crimes go hand in hand, and this return gives further testimony of the fact. Munster, which so frequently supplies homilies to the judges of assize, heads the list, and the two counties which have supplied the greatest number of prisoners are far ahead of all others in the country in the number of evictions. Mayo is first with a grand total of 110 families or 588 persons, and next comes Kerry with 90 evicted families or 654 persons. Of the total of 655 families evicted during the three months 21 were re-admitted as tenants and in Kerry only two were re-admitted. How the process of eviction affects the English taxpayer as well as the evicted is illustrated in a question which Mr. Conyngham put to the Chief Secretary for Ireland in the House of Commons. Mr. Conyngham asked what was the total cost to the British taxpayers, inclusive of special allowances, provisions, traveling and car expenses of the force of 150 constabulary employed on special duty in connection with the Glenbeigh evictions. The answer of the Secretary was that the total expenses amounted to \$451.

"It may be pleasant," says the paper to which we are indebted for these figures,

for the rack-renter to fling his tenantry out upon the roadside, but the English taxpayer will probably have a word to say on the subject when he finds that he is paying the piper."

WHOLESALE BRIBERY.

Nova Scotia was carried by the Conservatives, beyond doubt, with wholesale bribery. Sir Charles Tupper promised the expenditure of money on railways to the extent of ten millions, in addition to subsidies already granted. A proof of the extravagant and unconstitutional means resorted to for the purpose of bribing a whole province has been furnished by a letter addressed to Mr. Blake by a party in Nova Scotia. Mr. Blake's answer explains the whole matter. It reads as follows:—

"MY DEAR SIR,—I have your letter of 8th. You inform me that Sir Charles Tupper and Mr. McLellan are promising the people of Colchester and Cumberland and Pictou that, if they sustain the Government, a new policy, not as yet communicated to or passed on by Parliament, will be adopted as to the railway you mention, and that it will be constructed as a government work.

"I am glad that the people, while unwilling to trust Messrs. Tupper and McLellan, wish from me an assurance that I will do as much for them as these gentlemen offer; and you tell me that such an assurance will materially help our prospects in the three counties.

"It is plain that, if the course now put forward were to be adopted, it should have been laid before Parliament, and discussed and decided on its merits. Instead of this it has been kept back till the elections, and is now put forward in the locality as a bribe—a wholesale bribe, to three counties. I cannot take part in an auction of the votes of Colchester, Cumberland and Pictou. I never give a promise unless I am satisfied that it is right, and that I can redeem my word. It is possible that the course proposed to be taken as to this railway is justifiable, and if that be shown I will support it on whichever side of the house I sit, or whichever way the people of the three counties may vote. But I have not before me at this time sufficient information as to the conditions of the road, the cost of completion and the other important points involved, to enable me to form a judgment on the question, and therefore I cannot now conscientiously make the pledge which you tell me is so important in the interests of the Liberal cause.

"Yours truly,

"EDWARD BLAKE."

This is the letter of a statesman and an honorable man. What a splendid contrast it presents to the bribery, trickery and dishonesty of Sir John and Sir Charles. We have taken the liberty of italicizing two sentences in this letter as luminous expressions of the principles, dignity, honor and justice which animate the leader of the Liberal party. No doubt, had he been capable of stooping to "party exigencies," he could have secured a different result in some of the Nova Scotia constituencies. But Mr. Blake is not a man of that sort. But what are we to think of a country that could reject the author of this noble letter for a man whose whole political faith is comprised in the one word Boodle!

THE GATINEAU VALLEY RAILWAY.

The condition of this enterprise furnishes a striking illustration of evil effects resulting from the Tory policy of placing great enterprises in the hands of impetuous politicians, subsidizing them, and endowing them with valuable franchises. The Gatineau Valley is a rich and populous district. Naturally it is one of the most beautiful regions in Canada, and possesses untold wealth in agriculture, timber and minerals. All it wants is a railway to enable its enterprising inhabitants to realize the great advantages they possess. A charter was obtained to build a railway, but unfortunately it fell into the hands of a parliamentary promoter in the person of Mr. C. H. Mackintosh, late member of the Commons for the city of Ottawa, a man without capital, who has ever since become possessed of it failed to interest any responsible parties in the construction of the road. He succeeded, however, in securing heavy subsidies from the Government of Quebec in land and from the Government of the Dominion in money, and with these advantages he has alternately visited London and New York, seeking to dispose of the charter to the best advantage for himself and associates. It is said that men able and willing to undertake the work were found, but they declined to have anything to do with it, because of the rapacity of the demands made upon them.

Years elapsed, during which the people of the Gatineau became clamorous for the railway. They held public meetings, at some of which Mr. Mackintosh appeared and made plausible representations. He even fixed a date for the commencement of construction. Mr. Alonzo Wright, M. P. for the County of Ottawa, lent his great influence in favor of Mackintosh, but all promises failed. Meanwhile the term of the charter was running out, and just before the meeting of the present session of the Legislature of Quebec a notice appeared in the Official Gazette of the province, giving notice of application for an act amending the act of incorporation of the Gatineau Valley Railway. The amendment was to grant fresh powers to the board of directors, permitting them to amalgamate with other companies to raise mortgage bonds, to extend the delays for construction and "for other purposes." A petition was immediately signed by nearly all the inhabitants of the Gatineau Valley, and by hundreds of others throughout the county, for the purpose of counteracting this movement; or at least securing in some way the guarantee of the good faith of the board.

The people had become sick of the phantom capitalist delusion which Mackintosh had imposed upon them, and when further delay was sought they would stand no more nonsense. The petition was got up and was signed by every man of note and property on the Gatineau asking that the board of directors should deposit \$50,000 with the

Government as a guarantee of good faith and that the work of construction should be commenced not later than the first of May next. This petition set forth in plain terms very strong reasons why the charter should be revoked or the man who held it compelled to go on with the work. But Mackintosh was secure in having two Tory governments at his back. Now, happily, he has only one, and we trust Mr. Meredith will make short work of the Quebec end of this gigantic humbug by withdrawing the land grant, which he can properly do on account of the nonfulfillment of the terms on which it was conceded, and cancelling the charter. Such action would be hailed with delight by the people of the Gatineau, whose sentiments have been well expressed by Mr. Joshua Ellard, ex-warden of the county and a leading resident of the Upper Gatineau, in a letter which appears in the Aymier Times of February 24th.

It is a crying shame that a country possessing such enormous wealth of timber, minerals and agriculture should be deprived of markets because chyster politicians have got hold of the charter of their railway, and, without a cent of capital or means for raising a cent, are hanging on to it like grim death with the hope of making a pile. For six years Mackintosh has been peddling the charter, till everybody is sick of it and of him. Take it from him is what the people of the Gatineau say, and they are right.

ENGLISH OPINION OF THE IRISH CAUSE.

Coercion in its most atrocious forms is now being applied to Ireland. But so well has the press exposed the conduct of the Government and the landlords, that a deep feeling of shame and indignation is spreading throughout England. Of late, prominent Englishmen have expressed in strong terms their condemnation of the atrocities perpetrated in the name of law in Ireland. Mr. Conyngham, M. P., thus expressed himself recently:—"If amongst us in England the government of the country, no matter in obedience to what infernal laws the landlords have produced and passed in their own interest—if the Government sent an evicting force among us, sent men with crowbars and paraffine oil and matches in order to burn down the homesteads of our miners and other people, I tell you before heaven, men, that I would be the first to head the biggest crowd of stalwart Englishmen I could gather round me, and I would not stop for one moment until I had at any rate done something to sweep away the curse of landlordism which oppresses us almost as badly as it does yourselves."

Honest indignation expressed thus forcibly shows that Englishmen are becoming alive to the political as well as the human necessity of doing justice to Ireland and putting a stop to scenes which are a disgrace to civilization.

On a recent occasion the London Telegraph, treating of evictions in Ireland, quoted Mr. Froude, who of all men living cannot be accused of partiality to the Irish. He described the land system introduced by the English owners of the soil as "a grinding tyranny, the more unbearable because inflicted by aliens in blood and creed."

The same paper also reproduced what Mr. Gladstone said in April, 1886:—"We cannot wash ourselves clean and clear of the responsibility. The deeds of the Irish landlords are to a great extent our deeds. We are particeps criminis; we, with power in our hands, looked on; we not only encouraged, but sustained." Therefore, he asserted that it was an "obligation of honor and of policy" to buy out the landlords whom we had established on the soil and who were, he said, "our garrison in Ireland."

It is well that these expressions of a sense of the wrong inflicted on Ireland and the stern necessity for justice and reparation should be brought prominently before the people of England. We believe that, as a people, they would desire to see all wrongs righted, but the Government is in the hands of a class whose interests are opposed to justice, and whose baleful influence is still unfortunately paramount. The Telegraph tells how Archbishop Croke converted Pope Leo XIII. to condonation of the "plan of campaign." "What would your Holiness say," asked Dr. Croke, "if a poor peasant of the Romagna were to hire for a few souils a barren rock in the Apennines, and were to inclose it with a wall and plant it with a vineyard and build on it a house, and if when the vines began to bear fruit, the lord of the soil were at once to raise the rent to the full value of the improvement made, and if, on failure to pay, the poor peasant were to be turned out and his labor confiscated?" "I should call it," said the Pope, "a robbery." To which the Archbishop replied, "That, Holy Father, has been the whole history of the land quarrel for generations in Ireland."

The truth of this illustration is admitted, and surely there is enough British wisdom and statesmanship to solve the difficulty. It must be solved, come what may. Venomous partisanship and vested interests to the contrary notwithstanding.

OUR FOREIGN RELATIONS.

However we may be inclined to find fault with The Mail for the attitude it has assumed towards the majority in this province, we cannot refuse to recognize the ability with which it voices the sentiments of a large section of the Conservative party. We have only to recall the often quoted remarks of Messrs. White, McCarthy, Boubise and others, to be assured that, whatever party exigencies may now dictate, a strong bond of sympathy exists between the chief organ and the Conservative leaders. The Mail was established to educate the Conservative party; and though it failed to convert the Liberals to its No Popery programme, it has succeeded at all events in consolidating Toryism in the bosom of Macdonaldism. In anticipation of a Conservative defeat at

the late elections, it began to further educate its party to the acceptance of a policy of annexation, which Sir John would undoubtedly have adopted had he been defeated.

Everybody knows, business men more particularly, that the present strained and unnatural relations between the Dominion and its nearest neighbor cannot last. A solution must be found for existing difficulties, and if the history of British diplomacy in relation to America since the Declaration of Independence conveys any lesson it is one which ought to prepare us for another sacrifice of our interests to the necessities of the Empire. No doubt there are many amongst us who would submit cheerfully to any sacrifice for the good and the glory of the Empire; but men who are guided more by practical considerations than sentimental associations must see that a time is approaching rapidly when the relations between England and the United States, through Canada, must be settled on some more enduring, common sense basis than that which at present obtains.

Admitting that the conduct of the Americans has been selfish and arrogant towards this dependency, we must remember that our Canadian Tory party and press have never hesitated to display hatred towards the United States. It is time, however, that this hereditary stupidity, bequeathed to Canadians by their U. E. loyalist forefathers, was buried in the great lakes. British aristocrats have learned to forget it, and of late a natural yearning for friendships, so to speak, has been developed among the better minds on both sides of the Atlantic. That an enduring friendship could be established between the Empire and the Republic is beyond doubt. Two great questions must be settled before that much desired object can be attained. These are:—

- 1st—The Irish question.
2nd—The Canadian question.

Every day brings England closer to a conflict, which may not only involve her empire beyond the seas, but her very existence as a nation. In the face of this indubitable fact it seems like the perversity of fate to see her exasperating the Irish people at home and abroad by a wanton cruelty and injustice, while she encourages Canadian Tories in their foolish blustering in relation to the fisheries dispute. Thus, in the face of a probable and ultimately inevitable war, England invites the enmity of the only two peoples on the face of the earth who are her natural allies, and who would stand with her against the world were she only to be just to the one and generous to the other.

It is plain as a pikestaff that England will not go to war with America over what General Wolsley calls "a miserable kettle of fish." What then can Canadians, who cannot hope to fight it out for themselves, expect from a proud, sensitive, powerful nation towards which they have never shown anything but dislike which blossomed into enmity whenever the Republic was in trouble? We must look this matter square in the face.

England will not fight for us nor all the fish in the sea. We cannot fight for ourselves without becoming more ridiculous than heroic. What then must we do? Prepare for the inevitable!

Yet the Empire can be saved, not only saved, but raised to a height of glory it has never attained. Ireland can be made contented and prosperous, Canada can be secured for all time, and the friendship of the United States established beyond the possibility of rupture by the adoption of a policy of justice and conciliation. But such a policy must fail of adoption, to the risk of the happiness of all concerned, till Toryism is brought under the heel of Democracy, and men with hearts and brains take the places now unworthily filled by creatures who have neither. If The Mail can educate its readers to an acceptance of these common sense views, it will do much to earn forgiveness for its past folly and extravagance.

JUDGE BABY AND THE LICENSE QUESTION.

Judge Baby touched upon the question of licensing saloons and taverns in his able and learned address to the Grand Jury the other day. His remarks were what we should expect from one in his position. But it strikes us that judges—who are, of course, all good lawyers—do not always discern the true teachings of their profession: We do not presume to find fault with Judge Baby; but what we wish to point out is the falling of legal men in imagining that it is only necessary to pass a law and the desired reform follows as a matter of course. Unfortunately, human laws, like human justice, are not like the divine laws,—they can be evaded. Furthermore, if they are not consonant with the will of a large number among the many they are violated with impunity, and law is brought into contempt. Nevertheless, there is a law, a law to which lawyers, as a rule, give little heed. It bears remarkably on this very question of licensing saloons and taverns. It is a social and economical law, which is exactly expressed in the somewhat hackneyed term, "supply and demand." In every community there are just so many persons in every trade and calling as the necessities of those composing that community require. No more. If the business is overdone, somebody loses money in it, drops out and the equilibrium is restored. Litigation is a bad thing, why not restrict the number of lawyers? Men become lawyers who have no aptitude for law, discover their mistake and adopt some other profession. Restriction of the number of persons who shall engage in any calling is a purely communistic doctrine. It is monopoly in disguise. Eastern countries which adopted the principle advocated by Judge Baby—and they are the only nations who ever thoroughly carried it out—not only restricted the number for each trade, but

made callings hereditary, and eventually established the system of caste. Such a result is impossible in Canada. The territory is too vast, the people too free. Therefore, the advocates of restriction may rest assured, that for every legitimate license they suppress an illegitimate one or more will be established.

Let us take a glance at the history of English law on this subject.

Down to the time of the passage of 5 and 6 Edward VI., any one could keep an alehouse or tavern, the same as anyone can keep a dry goods or clothing shop now. These statutes were enacted to regulate places where liquor was sold, and they provided that no person was to keep an alehouse without finding sureties for the observance of decency in his house. The legislators of those days had the same object in view that Judge Baby has now. By 1 James I., cap. 9, it was made penal to permit any person to sit and tittle in alehouses and inns longer than the time necessary for refreshment. This law was made perpetual in the 22nd year of the same reign, cap. 7. Thus it will be seen that there was a Prohibition party so long ago as the days of the British Solomon. Nevertheless the drink evil continued, and the temperance movement grew in strength. At last, in 1700, the vice of drunkenness had so deteriorated the nation that a prohibition was placed on the distilleries, and afterwards it was resolved in Parliament that the raising of the price of spirituous liquors (by stopping distillation) was a principal cause of the decreased consumption of them, and had greatly contributed to the health, sobriety, and industry of the common people. That, in order to continue the high price, a large additional duty be laid on them, to be drawn back on exportation.

The first Act licensing the retail of spirituous liquors was 9, George II. It was regarded as a triumph of the temperance party of the day, inasmuch as it brought the trade directly under the law. Yet it was denounced by a bishop of the Established Church—the Bishop of Worcester, if our memory serves, books are not handy—as an Act for raising money for the supply of Government, by what cost the people their lives and their souls.

We produce these references to show that this is a very old question, and that the history of its legal aspect establishes the opinion that statutory enactments have been futile to prevent drunkenness whenever they stopped short of absolute prohibition of manufacture. Even that was only a temporary success, as we have shown above.

Where then shall we look for a remedy to this great evil? Free trade in liquor, the surety system, licensing, high licenses, prohibition, have all been tried, and all have failed. Perhaps if Judge Baby and other good men like him will open their eyes and look about them they will discover that the remedy has been found; that it is being applied on all sides, and that it is working wonders which no amount of legislation could achieve. Those who are known to be sober are respected, trusted, advanced. Men of brilliant talent, great opportunities, high pretensions, are beaten every hour in the day in the race of life by the sober, the steady, the unassuming. The great social law of the survival of the fittest is having full play in a country and among a people who are too busy and exact in their methods of business to bother with incompetence. He who drinks is regarded as unreliable. He cannot be trusted. Wise, ambitious young men see this fact constantly before them. Life failures through drink may be seen at every crossing. And so the world is learning by experience and sobriety gains the day.

Temperance advocates should, therefore, lay this lesson to heart. They can, if they will place themselves in accord with the natural law, work with it, and succeed in suppressing a vice which, as we have seen, defied all the enactments, statutes, laws and regulations ever produced by the wisdom of parliaments.

NATIONAL CORRUPTION.

"When the houses of parliament are seen to be the tools of a ministry, Liberty is at an end." So wrote the illustrious Sidney. Is this the fact in Canada to-day? It was down to the date of the late general election, and now, under the forms of free government, we are called upon to witness a struggle between a false, unworthy ministry and the party of Reform. In the recent appeal to the people Sir John Macdonald outdid all his former exploits in what Goldwin Smith well described as "the practice of corruption in all its protean forms." Quebec West and Three Rivers were only extreme instances of the plan adopted everywhere by the Conservatives for carrying the elections.

There is no parallel in history for the corruption practised by the Ministerialists at the late elections. It was open, flagrant, boundless. An inexhaustible fund appeared to have been placed at the disposal of ministers, and we may be sure that those who supplied the money did not do so without security of being recouped. The manner in which the government secured its narrow majority furnishes the most extraordinary instances of the degradation and coercion of free people on record. Even the plebeian of Napoleon III. was purity itself compared with it. Nova Scotia was bribed wholesale, out of hand. Quebec was coerced, Ontario hired, Manitoba bullied. Everywhere resort was had to the worst, most demoralizing influences. In fact the people were corrupted, bribed, debauched, from one end of the country to the other. In Ottawa votes were bought openly on the street. Here in Montreal Opposition committees were corrupted on the eve of polling day. Sir Hector Langevin obtained ten majority at Three Rivers by issuing unlimited bribery and whiskey. At Quebec we know how