

THE TRUE WITNESS IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE Post Printing & Publishing Co., AT THREE OFFICES: 6 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada.

Subscription: per annum \$1.50 paid strictly in advance.

TO ADVERTISERS: A limited number of advertisements of approved character will be inserted in THE TRUE WITNESS at the per line (Sunday) first time only.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS: Subscribers in the country should always give the name of their Post Office.

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.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 20, 1886

THE "loyalist" delegates have received rather a set back. They have been studiously propagating the idea in the West that Mr. C. S. Parnell is a tyrannical landlord and has exacted his pound of flesh in a determined manner as any other person.

THE delegates who have come to this country to demolish Parnell and knock the theory of Home Rule into a cocked hat, must have met with rather a surprise last night at Kingston.

THE condition of Ireland, as produced by landlordism, is attracting the attention of certain economists in the United States, who fear that the trend of policy there is in a direction which will lead ultimately to similar results.

It is to be regretted that the principle of repudiation should have found its way into practice in the North-West. It is a matter almost of history how odious a stigma attached itself to certain of the United States in consequence of their having put the principle of repudiation into force and shuffled out of the fulfillment of their just obligations.

AN ASTOUNDING STATEMENT. It is much to be regretted that Lord Salisbury has for so long concealed his theories on

Irish grievances and permitted himself and the Conservative party to rest under the shadow of misrepresentation. But it must be confessed that they are themselves alone to blame for this. According to the cable despatches Lord Salisbury is reported to have yesterday made the following very significant and very plain statement: "The proposal to multiply small freshholds in Ireland originated with Mr. John Bright, who parted from Mr. Gladstone this year, but the proposal was never a party question."

CHURCH AND STATE.

If the Mail were published in the United States, it would now be in order for it to denounce the Methodist body in the same terms of unmeasured abuse which it has used in dealing with the Catholic Church generally, but particularly in Quebec. It seems the Methodist denomination in the United States has taken a decided stand on prohibition and embodied in the discipline of the Church, to which all members must subscribe, a law as fixed and immovable as any of the Mides and Persians, to the effect that the complete prohibition of the liquor traffic in alcoholic drinks is the duty of civil government.

THE TREATY.

The New York Herald is either very correct or very much deceived, for it gives what purports to be the full text of the proposed treaty between Great Britain and the United States, to which reference has already been made in these columns, and which the local party organs are declaring to be merely the baseless fabric of a vision. It is a peculiar coincidence because it was "whispered" that Sir Lionel Sackville-West when in Quebec a few weeks ago had the draft of a treaty in his pocket and that it was in connection with it that he was at the Citadel with the Governor-General for some days.

The time of these arrangements is fixed absolutely for twenty years, and is subject to be determined thereafter on one year's notice by either party. There is no reason why some such basis of negotiations should not be in existence, though, if it be true, we are inclined to think it would need much modification. So far as denials at Washington are concerned, that proves nothing. It is the duty of diplomatists to "deny" in such cases, and it will be a sorry day for diplomacy when international treaties of moment become subjects for the tender mercies of strolling reporters of newspapers. In view of the statement of the British Secretary of State in the House of Commons on Wednesday, it seems that the Herald "lies like truth."

THE PARNELL BILL.

The defeat of the Parnell land bill seemed a foregone conclusion after the speech of the member for Liverpool. The majority against it has been evidently on a straight party vote, without any consideration of justice or right. The course of the Government is inexplicable. They had a splendid opportunity by accepting the principle of the bill of showing that they are at least sincere in their desire to do good to Ireland and ameliorate the condition of her people. They seemed, indeed, at first to be working on such lines as would enable them to do something in this direction. But they have suddenly let the friends of Ireland have their say, have curtly replied by the mouth of the Chief Secretary, and had the measure voted down. But we have hope that the tide of public opinion is too strongly in favor of the suffering Irish to permit any of the horrors which may, by process of law, now be vented on the heads of the unhappy tenants, who may be unable to pay their rent, being witnessed during the coming winter. The English people are becoming fully sensible of the great and disastrous effect the fall in values has had on the tenants in Ireland, and a ruthless course of action will, we hope, be prevented by the force of public sentiment.

IRLAND IN 1796.

The issue of a Royal Commission to enquire into the condition of Ireland seems, as we have said before, to indicate that there is a great lack of knowledge on the part of the English concerning the condition of Ireland. While there is no doubt of the ignorance in the average English mind as to the economic and other conditions of Ireland, there is not enough to justify the existing order of things. Books old and modern have been issued by the score from all sorts of presses and places, and if the English do not know what is passing in Ireland it must be because they won't know. Have they not Dean Swift's works as a sort of classic? And the want of knowledge, if it exists, cannot be attributed to want of books or other literature on the subject.

THE MAIL'S OFFENCE.

No one has been deceived by the recent hysterical assertion of independence by the Toronto Mail. And after all its dependence, or independence, is, perhaps, so far as politics are concerned, not a great matter of moment, and judging from much of its past, and certainly its present course, any party would be well rid of it. But at present that course has so peculiarly dark, repulsive and evil a side to it, and is so wicked and malicious, its declaration of pretended independence cannot be permitted to pass by with indifference by the public. No one, be he of what party he may, can do his duty as a citizen and not protest against the outrageous propositions of the Mail, and conduct himself politically accordingly. As a fact, it is gratifying to see that its conduct has been received with expressions of disgust by all parties, excepting, of course, that band of fanatics who, under the banner of Orangeism, are too invincibly ignorant to look out of the narrow groove in which they run their evil course. Conservative and Liberal alike have the common sense to see that if the conclusions of the Mail be pushed to their full conclusion, nothing but strife, fully equaling, if not excelling, that which disgraces Belfast, would physically ensue, while politically the Dominion would be hopelessly ruined. But apart from this the Mail seems to overlook the fact, no doubt without knowing what it is doing, that it is cutting at its own Protestant friends, and not a line which it has published is not a two-edged sword. For example, in its manifesto it states with reference to the Church: "She has no right to appear at all as a Church within the field of civil polity or secular administration. She is entitled, like every other religious body, to the widest freedom of conscience and worship, but beyond that her claims are mere usurpations which must be met and overthrown, even though in the case of Quebec an alteration of the constitution should be found necessary."

THE RUMORED TREATY.

The statements made in the Washington papers on the strength of telegrams from Ottawa, concerning the settlement of the fisheries and other trade matters between this country and the United States, may or may not be true. If not true, the telegrams at least lie very much like possible truth. That negotiations are, and have been, afoot for some time is a matter of notoriety, and that they were recently in a fair way of settlement has also been officially declared in the Imperial House of Commons by one of the Cabinet. The telegrams in fact state very little more than this. All that is said is that "a commercial treaty has been drawn up between the English and the United States Governments relative to Canada and that it is now being submitted to the Canadian Government for suggestions as to details. This treaty provides for an amicable settlement of the fishery dispute, and also reciprocal trade relations with the two countries. A Cabinet meeting was held here yesterday, when the new treaty was laid before the Ministers for consideration. The Hon. Mr. Thomson, Minister of Justice, said this evening that the treaty had not been definitely concluded. He tacitly admitted, however, that the provisions

were on the whole satisfactory." This information is not much more than has been known for some time, though if the additional details are correct all to be said is that they afford matter for cordial congratulation. It was no secret that Lord Lansdowne went to England in connection with the subject, after a visit of some days from Sir Sackville West; and as a treaty is in course of negotiation there is no reason why the statement should not be true. But we note a tendency in certain party organs to try, if anything, to strengthen rather than weaken the hands of those in Washington who have already blocked the way to a reasonable settlement of the relations between Canada and the United States. This is perhaps not inexplicable, but we doubt whether the people of the Maritime Provinces, or the people of Canada generally, will thank these hide-bound partisans for acting in this manner. There are local matters enough for vigorous party warfare, but in such a matter as this proposed treaty the politicians and their press should become patriotic and dignified. A reverse course is not likely to elevate Canada in the eyes of the United States.

THE MAIL'S OFFENCE.

No one has been deceived by the recent hysterical assertion of independence by the Toronto Mail. And after all its dependence, or independence, is, perhaps, so far as politics are concerned, not a great matter of moment, and judging from much of its past, and certainly its present course, any party would be well rid of it. But at present that course has so peculiarly dark, repulsive and evil a side to it, and is so wicked and malicious, its declaration of pretended independence cannot be permitted to pass by with indifference by the public. No one, be he of what party he may, can do his duty as a citizen and not protest against the outrageous propositions of the Mail, and conduct himself politically accordingly. As a fact, it is gratifying to see that its conduct has been received with expressions of disgust by all parties, excepting, of course, that band of fanatics who, under the banner of Orangeism, are too invincibly ignorant to look out of the narrow groove in which they run their evil course. Conservative and Liberal alike have the common sense to see that if the conclusions of the Mail be pushed to their full conclusion, nothing but strife, fully equaling, if not excelling, that which disgraces Belfast, would physically ensue, while politically the Dominion would be hopelessly ruined. But apart from this the Mail seems to overlook the fact, no doubt without knowing what it is doing, that it is cutting at its own Protestant friends, and not a line which it has published is not a two-edged sword. For example, in its manifesto it states with reference to the Church: "She has no right to appear at all as a Church within the field of civil polity or secular administration. She is entitled, like every other religious body, to the widest freedom of conscience and worship, but beyond that her claims are mere usurpations which must be met and overthrown, even though in the case of Quebec an alteration of the constitution should be found necessary."

THE MAIL'S OFFENCE.

No one has been deceived by the recent hysterical assertion of independence by the Toronto Mail. And after all its dependence, or independence, is, perhaps, so far as politics are concerned, not a great matter of moment, and judging from much of its past, and certainly its present course, any party would be well rid of it. But at present that course has so peculiarly dark, repulsive and evil a side to it, and is so wicked and malicious, its declaration of pretended independence cannot be permitted to pass by with indifference by the public. No one, be he of what party he may, can do his duty as a citizen and not protest against the outrageous propositions of the Mail, and conduct himself politically accordingly. As a fact, it is gratifying to see that its conduct has been received with expressions of disgust by all parties, excepting, of course, that band of fanatics who, under the banner of Orangeism, are too invincibly ignorant to look out of the narrow groove in which they run their evil course. Conservative and Liberal alike have the common sense to see that if the conclusions of the Mail be pushed to their full conclusion, nothing but strife, fully equaling, if not excelling, that which disgraces Belfast, would physically ensue, while politically the Dominion would be hopelessly ruined. But apart from this the Mail seems to overlook the fact, no doubt without knowing what it is doing, that it is cutting at its own Protestant friends, and not a line which it has published is not a two-edged sword. For example, in its manifesto it states with reference to the Church: "She has no right to appear at all as a Church within the field of civil polity or secular administration. She is entitled, like every other religious body, to the widest freedom of conscience and worship, but beyond that her claims are mere usurpations which must be met and overthrown, even though in the case of Quebec an alteration of the constitution should be found necessary."

THE MAIL'S OFFENCE.

No one has been deceived by the recent hysterical assertion of independence by the Toronto Mail. And after all its dependence, or independence, is, perhaps, so far as politics are concerned, not a great matter of moment, and judging from much of its past, and certainly its present course, any party would be well rid of it. But at present that course has so peculiarly dark, repulsive and evil a side to it, and is so wicked and malicious, its declaration of pretended independence cannot be permitted to pass by with indifference by the public. No one, be he of what party he may, can do his duty as a citizen and not protest against the outrageous propositions of the Mail, and conduct himself politically accordingly. As a fact, it is gratifying to see that its conduct has been received with expressions of disgust by all parties, excepting, of course, that band of fanatics who, under the banner of Orangeism, are too invincibly ignorant to look out of the narrow groove in which they run their evil course. Conservative and Liberal alike have the common sense to see that if the conclusions of the Mail be pushed to their full conclusion, nothing but strife, fully equaling, if not excelling, that which disgraces Belfast, would physically ensue, while politically the Dominion would be hopelessly ruined. But apart from this the Mail seems to overlook the fact, no doubt without knowing what it is doing, that it is cutting at its own Protestant friends, and not a line which it has published is not a two-edged sword. For example, in its manifesto it states with reference to the Church: "She has no right to appear at all as a Church within the field of civil polity or secular administration. She is entitled, like every other religious body, to the widest freedom of conscience and worship, but beyond that her claims are mere usurpations which must be met and overthrown, even though in the case of Quebec an alteration of the constitution should be found necessary."

the traveller to the following conclusions:—"But I must again remark how very easy it is to make these Irish subservient. In the hands of able men, actuated by true public spirit, they would be more easily kept in the right path than any people in the world. Their constant seditions are a proof of sensibility; don't try then to make them something else, but work on what is good in them and you'll be able to mould them as you please. You reproach the peasant with being lazy and thriftless. How do you expect anything else from a man who never can earn enough to live on? When he comes over to England the Irish laborer works like a horse and is as sober as a Spartan; and landlords who have tried at home the plan of paying him decently and building him a decent place to live in have found it answers admirably. Let England lay aside her ridiculous prejudices and let her make Ireland really (the italics are Latocnoy's) share in the beneficent laws that she has made for herself. This will she gain the love of four millions of subjects whom her arms have conquered, but whom nothing but justice can make content."

The ignorance and prejudice—just a song to-day—existing in the English breast concerning the Irish strikes the traveller, and he says:—"It is not so with us. A Provincial is proud of being the fellow-subject of a Norman, a native of Old France has no antipathy to a Briton. Why is there such a different feeling between Irish and English?"

The revival of this old book is opportune. So far as the observations in it are concerned they are as applicable to-day as they were a century ago, and Macmillan's have done service at this juncture in publishing this very interesting article. The author was by no means a revolutionary—quite the reverse—he was a Loyalist exile from France. It is to be regretted that he did not, like some of his countrymen, take service under the British Crown, and that the service was not that of ruling Ireland. Had he done so the work of Mr. Parnell would have been anticipated.

THE MAIL'S OFFENCE.

No one has been deceived by the recent hysterical assertion of independence by the Toronto Mail. And after all its dependence, or independence, is, perhaps, so far as politics are concerned, not a great matter of moment, and judging from much of its past, and certainly its present course, any party would be well rid of it. But at present that course has so peculiarly dark, repulsive and evil a side to it, and is so wicked and malicious, its declaration of pretended independence cannot be permitted to pass by with indifference by the public. No one, be he of what party he may, can do his duty as a citizen and not protest against the outrageous propositions of the Mail, and conduct himself politically accordingly. As a fact, it is gratifying to see that its conduct has been received with expressions of disgust by all parties, excepting, of course, that band of fanatics who, under the banner of Orangeism, are too invincibly ignorant to look out of the narrow groove in which they run their evil course. Conservative and Liberal alike have the common sense to see that if the conclusions of the Mail be pushed to their full conclusion, nothing but strife, fully equaling, if not excelling, that which disgraces Belfast, would physically ensue, while politically the Dominion would be hopelessly ruined. But apart from this the Mail seems to overlook the fact, no doubt without knowing what it is doing, that it is cutting at its own Protestant friends, and not a line which it has published is not a two-edged sword. For example, in its manifesto it states with reference to the Church: "She has no right to appear at all as a Church within the field of civil polity or secular administration. She is entitled, like every other religious body, to the widest freedom of conscience and worship, but beyond that her claims are mere usurpations which must be met and overthrown, even though in the case of Quebec an alteration of the constitution should be found necessary."

THE MAIL'S OFFENCE.

No one has been deceived by the recent hysterical assertion of independence by the Toronto Mail. And after all its dependence, or independence, is, perhaps, so far as politics are concerned, not a great matter of moment, and judging from much of its past, and certainly its present course, any party would be well rid of it. But at present that course has so peculiarly dark, repulsive and evil a side to it, and is so wicked and malicious, its declaration of pretended independence cannot be permitted to pass by with indifference by the public. No one, be he of what party he may, can do his duty as a citizen and not protest against the outrageous propositions of the Mail, and conduct himself politically accordingly. As a fact, it is gratifying to see that its conduct has been received with expressions of disgust by all parties, excepting, of course, that band of fanatics who, under the banner of Orangeism, are too invincibly ignorant to look out of the narrow groove in which they run their evil course. Conservative and Liberal alike have the common sense to see that if the conclusions of the Mail be pushed to their full conclusion, nothing but strife, fully equaling, if not excelling, that which disgraces Belfast, would physically ensue, while politically the Dominion would be hopelessly ruined. But apart from this the Mail seems to overlook the fact, no doubt without knowing what it is doing, that it is cutting at its own Protestant friends, and not a line which it has published is not a two-edged sword. For example, in its manifesto it states with reference to the Church: "She has no right to appear at all as a Church within the field of civil polity or secular administration. She is entitled, like every other religious body, to the widest freedom of conscience and worship, but beyond that her claims are mere usurpations which must be met and overthrown, even though in the case of Quebec an alteration of the constitution should be found necessary."

SPIRIT OF THE PRESS.

Those of our worthy Protestant fellow-citizens who are fond of setting up Catholics as bigots by nature are invited to study the following words of Mayor Grace, of New York:—"All this talk to the effect that I am seeking to run for governor of this State in 1888 is absurd. After the fate of Kierman, I do not believe Roman Catholic candidate would stand any chance in a race for the governorship in New York State. That do they think of that? How can they pluck up heart to parade the Spanish Inquisition and the other choice flowers of a stern and bloody age? That was long ago, and Protestants were as swift to persecute Catholics as Catholics persecute Protestants. But here and now, in this day, in these United States, we find the same old Catholic bigotry occurring in the same old-fashioned manner. Which of the two is the real spirit of our American institutions?—V. Y. Freeman."

Rev. Dr. Kane said in so many words that if Parliament grants Home Rule to Ireland Orangeism will rise in rebellion. We rather think that it is just about as reasonable as anything said in the Chicago convention. Will the London Press demand that the rev. doctor be placed on trial for sedition?—London Advertiser.

It is worthy of notice that Reuter's Canadian agent in his despatch giving more prominence to the doings of the anti-Home Rule delegates than to anything else that occurs in Canada. In fact during a whole week, for which papers are just received, he mentions nothing but these delegates, except that he gives two or three lines about the Manitoba harvest. Two or three weeks under the impression that two or three important events have happened, and for the anti-Gladstone delegates the general impression here is that they and their mission have fallen as flat as a flounder.—Globe.

We cannot understand what newspapers in Canada expect to gain by abuse of their contemporaries and of public men. Surely, the average newspaper reader does not approve of a coarse and vulgar language which is to be found in most of the columns of the journals. If he does approve of it, then the journals would be only performing a great moral act if he would quit reading to a taste so depraved. But we have reason to believe that the opposite is the case and that the general public of Canada do not like to read the vituperative rubbish which is so freely heaped up to them red-hot and hissing from the vulgar furnace of abuse. The depraved journalist who imagines that forcible writing consists of calling names, and the abusive epithets are stronger weapons than argument and reason, is to blame for the coarse writing which we find in the press. Just before the elections, the powerless public have to submit usually to some columns of disgraceful language. And they are not to be helped for the coarse gang of rowdy journalists is in full feather to-day, and we may expect the torrent of filth to flow until declaration day. This is to be deplored, and decent journalists do deprecate it, the world over. In England we do not find this state of things existing. In that land men of letters, and the best intellects, publish only in a manly and intelligent way. The newspapers do not stoop to low abuse. With us it is different and billingsgate, rather than the English Goldsmith, prevails.—Quebec Chronicle.

The British Good Templars are quarrelling with a recent decision of their Grand Lodge. Woman was the root of all the trouble. The younger brethren at the order's public gatherings have made it a practice to play a card game, in which the good-looking sisters participated, that the puritan disapproval of the elder brethren, who may possibly have lost favor in the eyes of the fair sex, did not the Grand Lodge really carry its prohibitory ideas too far? What harm can there be in the exhilarating intoxication of a kiss?—Toronto Press.

THE TROUBLES THAT THREATEN CIVIL SOCIETY. The growing antagonism of what are called the working classes to capitalists who employ them is an unmistakable fact. But the danger which grows out of this fact, and the strength which it gives to destructive Socialism are not generally perceived. Of this we are not perceptive, many are of the opinion that these dangers, after all, are not formidable, and that whenever an emergency arises, the strong arm of the law can be relied on to repress them. But this is a great mistake. We must not suppose that because in Chicago the Socialists succeeded in temporarily quelling the Socialist outbreak of the city, that they will always attend the action of our civil authorities when like outbreaks occur elsewhere. Law is very powerful. It is impossible to permanently destroy the peace and order of society and the authority of law, because they have their foundations in certain divinely constituted relations and principles. But, nevertheless, powerful as law is, the Socialists have not only trampled under foot, and then has been the fact that society cannot be permanently dissolved and replaced by chaos, and that law and order will always eventually reassert themselves, is no reason why we should regard without concern and apprehension the rapid spread of atheistic and destructive socialism in our midst.—Catholic Standard.

Mr. Curran, of Montreal, feels himself extremely uncomfortable company along with the Toronto Mail and Mr. Dalton McCarthy. Mr. Curran says that he does not at all approve of the course taken by the Mail; that when it has its crusade he took the part of the majority of dissenting from it. Not only did he condemn the articles, but he thinks that they did not meet with the approval of the great majority of the Tory party. Mr. Curran is mistaken. Whether the Tory party in Quebec may or may not be of the views expressed in the Toronto Mail and the great majority of the party in this Province, and they have been induced by the Prime Minister himself. It is true that political exigencies forced Sir John A. Macdonald to repudiate the Tory press and to declare that he would not be held responsible for the opinions which it expressed. But what says the great majority of the Tory party? They are of the opinion that they accept them as those of the Prime Minister. Sir John Macdonald no doubt knows that the people of this Province are not likely to be led away by cries of religious rancor. They are ready to express their own views on religious questions, but they have elected a majority to support Sir John A. Macdonald, not for the purpose of framing a new system of theology, but to honestly administer the secular affairs of the country within the limits appointed to the Federal Government and Parliament by the constitution. That duty Sir John has failed to discharge in an honest or satisfactory manner, and were he even more orthodox than he is, would not in the smallest degree condone his offenses as Minister of the Crown and member of Parliament.—London Advertiser.

One of the local gentlemen who spoke at the "Tory Loyalist" meeting in the Skating Rink on Tuesday evening, held in opposition to Irish Home Rule, ventured to say that the "wholesome sentiment" of this city was hostile to the cause of Irish Home Rule. The gentleman was probably sincere in his convictions, but his opportunities for observation and reflection must be limited. Let him take the press for example, and what is the result? The Free Press—a newspaper which has double the circulation of the other city papers—had the courage of its convictions and came out boldly in opposition to the views of the anti-Home Rule delegates. A second local newspaper—The Journal—did not have a few editorial remarks, but they were decidedly on the fence so far as the merits of the issue were concerned. Our third local newspaper—the Morning Citizen—has not only taken a word of commendation of the anti-Home Rule cause with which it sympathizes. Why is this? Because the Citizen dares not! Why does it dare not say a word in favor of the anti-Home Rule cause? Because it has not the moral courage to brave the overwhelming sentiment of the city, which favors a measure of Home Rule for Ireland. The Citizen has no reason to be pleased with their reception—for the