

*The Roman Catholics and the Union.*

There had for years been a growing feeling among intelligent Roman Catholics of the desirableness of a Union. Out of a hierarchy of four R. C. Archbishops and sixteen Bishops (three sees were vacant) four Archbishops, fourteen bishops and the agent of the secular bishops were for the Union. The Roman Catholic gentry and nobility were also for it. Plowden, the Catholic historian, says, p. 135, "All the inferior clergy seem to have declared for it." He also (Vol. II. p. 979) states that "A very great preponderance in favour of the Union existed in the Catholic body, particularly in the nobility, gentry and clergy," (p. 139) "Not a single petition against the Union was presented by the Catholics to the King, Lord Lieutenant, or either House of Parliament." This last fact proves conclusively that the Catholics were in favour of the measure.

*The Charge of Bribery.*

It has been alleged that the Union was won by bribery, but no evidence has been adduced to prove it. It rests upon simple statements which in a court of justice are laughed to scorn when no evidence in support is tendered. It savours somewhat of an Irish bull to bribe a man to do a thing after he has told you that he has made up his mind to do it, or that it is for his interest to do it.

The chief support at the present day of the charge of bribery, is the unsupported statement of a man who has raised falsehood into one of the fine arts; who, after having for years upheld the view that there was no bribery, now, to serve his own purposes asserts that there was the greatest possible corruption.

The pretence for the charge is, that the owners of the pocket boroughs in Ireland were compensated on being deprived of the right to return members. There were 300 members of the Irish House of Commons, but there were only to be 103 in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, consequently 197 were to be left out in the cold. But the compensation was not to be paid to the 197 members—men who, like Grattan, had paid thousands of pounds to borough proprietors for their seats—men perfectly independent of these borough owners, with five years more to sit, and who, unlike Grattan, yet voted for the Union and their own political extinguishment, voted to kick away the ladder by which they hoped to climb to place or fame without receiving a shilling. Is this bribery?

When one examines the case carefully it shows that, with all their faults and shortcomings, there must have been genuine patriotism in the majority of the Irish House of Commons in 1800.

How many of the members of the Ontario Local House, or the Dominion Parliament would, like the majority in Dublin in 1800, vote for a Bill which would immediately relegate them to private life, and prevent their ever getting into Parliament again, and this without receiving a dollar compensation?

In England, up till 1832, there were rotten or nomination boroughs that could be bought from proprietors. It was so in Ireland in Grattan's Parliament. The Irish House sat for eight years. Therefore, when a man like Grattan bought a seat he kept it during the eight years as his property, and would deeply resent any attempt by the owner to dictate to him how he should vote.

When Pitt, in 1785, introduced his unsuccessful Reform Bill into the British Parliament he proposed to buy up the rotten boroughs for £27,000 each, and to distribute the seats to more populous places. In the Irish case compensation was to be paid at the rate of £15,000 for each seat. If the place was completely disfranchised £15,000 was to be paid to its owner, or the borough itself if there was no owner, but nothing was to be paid to the member. If the borough had sent two members (a common case) and in future was to send only one, then no compensation was to be paid. In some cases there were more owners than one, and the £15,000 was then to be divided. Eighty-four boroughs were completely disfranchised, and consequently £1,260,000 was to be paid to the owners, and 168 members were to lose their seats. The compensation was paid as follows:—

1. To Englishmen who owned boroughs in Ireland	£67,500
2. Four boroughs which had no owners	60,000
3. To the executors of a man who died before the Union was even introduced	30,000
4. To two ladies who were owners	18,750
5. To Anti-Unionist proprietors whose members voted against the Union	434,850
	£611,100
6. To Unionist proprietors whose members voted for the Union and in most cases for their own political extinguishment	648,900
	£1,260,000

Ingram gives cases showing that during the last twenty years of the Irish Parliament the value of seats had risen greatly, and that it was a favourite investment for men who desired to rise in the world or in the political arena.

To own slaves—to buy them to stock a plantation with, was a far more reprehensible action than to own a borough, where in the course of generations the votes had dwindled to half-a-dozen, practically giving the power of returning a member to the landlord. Yet Gladstone in his maiden speech in the House of Commons distinctly stated that his father had bought 200 slaves to additionally stock the Vreedom Hoop plantation. Gladstone voted the following year for the compensation of the slave-owners, including his own father, who received £54,114. His father was old and in a few years Gladstone knew that he would receive a part of this compensation money. Would it be fair to say that Gladstone was bribed to vote for abolishing

slavery because in the course of nature he would receive part of the compensation money?

Gladstone, it will be said, did not actually receive the money—it was his father who did—for what the son in Parliament said was "honestly and legally acquired property." Neither did the members of the Irish House of Commons receive the money—as in Gladstone's case; it was other people, but in their case mostly strangers in blood.

It is clear that Gladstone was not bribed—equally clear that the Irish members were not. If it is contended that the latter were bribed who had nothing to do with the cash, either immediately or in the future, then Gladstone was bribed because the money would come to him in the near future.

This will shew the absurdity of the charge of bribery. If the argument is followed up to its legitimate conclusion the charge of bribery recoils upon Gladstone himself—"The engineer is hoisted with his own petard."

FAIRPLAY RADICAL.

## A NEW METHOD.

*To the Editor of THE WEEK:*

SIR,—The regulation of the liquor traffic so as to prevent or diminish its attendant evils is, and has long been, a question of great moment, for as yet the various methods, which have been recommended or adopted for that purpose, have been so defective as rather to increase the evils they are intended to remedy.

From their very nature these methods have necessarily been unsatisfactory and inefficient. The license system, being a survival of the principle of monopoly in that for a larger or smaller consideration it gives to a certain class the exclusive privilege of manufacturing or trading in certain merchandise to their exclusive benefit, and to the manifest detriment of society in general, is an abuse, the toleration of which is a disgrace to any constitutional Government. The prohibition system, whether its application be local, sectional or general, is equally subversive of the proper functions of government. The depriving every man of his right of choice in matters of meat or drink, because there are those who are abusers of themselves and others in their exercise of this right, is too unjustifiable an interference with personal liberty to be long tolerated by any other than a nation of slaves.

The existence of these two methods, each bearing witness to the inefficiency of the other, proves the necessity for some other method of regulating the traffic, and, by their exemplifying what is to be avoided in attempts at regulation, they assist us to the discovery of a better way. From them we learn that any such method must regulate without granting monopolies and without interfering with the inherent right of every man to do as he pleases, in so far as his doing so is not an interference with the liberty of others.

The uses of alcohol compel its manufacture and distribution, while its abuses make it deponent on the State so to control its traffic as to prevent these abuses. This can only be accomplished by the State's assuming complete and exclusive control of the importation, manufacture, and sale of everything alcoholic.

The assumption of such a control is a duty of the State. It rests with the people as a nation to do what the people as individuals can not do. The people, as individuals, cannot manage the liquor traffic. Its power for evil is too great for every man to be at liberty to engage in it. The taking this liberty from all and selling it as a license to the few is placing in the hands of those few a fearful power for evil, coupled with the greatest possible temptation to use that power; and surely those who seek the license do not seek it to escape the temptation.

The assumption of such control by the State is also practicable. A business which begets millionaire distillers, brewers, and importers, and wealthy dispensers of adulterated potations can be legitimately managed by the State at no pecuniary disadvantage. The revenue to the State from such exclusive control would assuredly maintain a local supply depot in each district, in charge of a salaried Government official whose duty it would be to sell, for certain specified prices, original sealed packages of certain sizes to any resident of the district, not a minor, who had not, because of drunkenness, forfeited his right to buy.

The adoption of this method by the State would be conducive to the temperance, good order, and prosperity of the nation. The salaried servant of the State, dependent on his good conduct for his continuance in office, would have no saloon-keeper's interest in "pushing the trade." A Government supply depot, selling only original packages for consumption elsewhere, would be a desirable substitute for the bar and bar-room, and could be much more readily inspected. Illicit selling, like illicit distilling, would then be a serious crime, to which there would be far less incentive than under a license or a prohibition system. The temperance advocate would have no organized opposition to contend with, nor would he be so beset with the temptation to lay down the weapon of moral suasion, and take up the boomerang of legal compulsion. Those greatest evils of the traffic begotten of and nurtured by the saloon would pass away with the system which gave them birth, while the State, which had erstwhile paid so dearly for the debauching of its citizens, would at least be in the only position to, at the same time, protect both itself and them.

T. A. PATRICK.

## THE NEW ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

*To the Editor of THE WEEK:*

SIR,—Perhaps it is yet too soon to expect any considerable expression of opinion from the reading public as to the merits of the new dictionary; but comprehensive as is the design and accurate as is the execution, some omissions have already been noted in the English review articles that I have lighted on. I have observed some myself, but I confess to some special vexation and surprise at a couple of omissions in the matter of definition. The Latin *abutor*, primarily meaning to "use up, entirely, to the end," naturally and inevitably came to signify to "misuse," "use improperly;" and it was to be expected that these meanings should be found in English when the Latin word was adopted. Accordingly, the New Dictionary, under the substantive, gives a very good example of the primary meaning, now obsolete in English: "Cranmer, Col. ii. 22. Touch not, tast not, handell not: which all peryeshe thorow the very abuse," where the Greek has an intensive form corresponding to the Latin "*abutor*," and where Wyclif, Tindale, and A. V. have "using." But when we come to the verb, the primary meaning is ignored, and only the secondary is noticed; and to make bad worse, among the examples of this secondary meaning is found a sentence in which, as all but the actually illiterate would see, the primary meaning is required. 1 Cor. ix. 18, of our common Bible, "That I abuse not my power in the Gospel." The latter meaning makes nonsense of the Apostles' argument; and is still further away from the Greek word here used than from that in the previous reference. Another place requiring the primary meaning is in the often quoted and much misunderstood words "using this world, as not abusing it." What makes this so bad is, that the revised version has properly in 1 Cor. ix. 18, "use to the full," and in 1 Cor. viii. 31, margin, "using it to the full," though the obsolete "abusing" is most mischievously retained in the text. I hardly know how to excuse this. But I have observed another omission under the word *Anaphora*. The New Dictionary gives only its meaning as a term in rhetoric; the Imperial Dictionary gives this and its astronomical meaning; while both admit its liturgical sense. Now, in the present day, liturgical treatises are no novelty. Nor is it only theologians who read them. Nay, they are in the hands of great numbers who do not use liturgies; and I think I may safely assert that for every time "*Anaphora*" is found by an English reader as a term of rhetoric or astronomy, it is found ten times in reference to liturgies. I may add, too, that it is the most important word in liturgical nomenclature; and I cannot well conceive how the omission of this signification could have taken place. As the work goes on we must expect to find not a few instances of error or oversight in this long-looked for and truly wonderful dictionary.

Port Perry, August, 1890.

JOHN CARRY.

## THE GARDEN'S BLOOM.

RONDEAU REDOUBLÉ.

THE garden's bloom fills all the summer day—  
A thrilling odour scents the drowsy air;  
The tender flowers yield to the Zephyr's sway;  
Each seems to cry "Behold me I am fair!"

Their warm, rich hues reward my tender care,  
They breathe on me in such a subtle way,  
That my whole being feels with rapture rare  
The garden's bloom fills all the summer day.

The eager bees the honeyed breath obey,  
And from their hives with busy wings repair,  
And, while among the varied tints they stray,  
A thrilling odour scents the drowsy air.

I have no thought of winter's pale despair,  
Of lowering clouds with aspect drear and gray;  
No thought of storms when the sad earth is bare—  
The tender flowers yield to the Zephyr's sway.

The humming-birds their rainbow hues display  
With tireless wings they dart now here, now there;  
The flowers to me are not one whit less gay,  
Each seems to cry, "Behold me I am fair!"

Of all the joys earth renders as my share,  
One joy most closely to my heart I'll lay,  
No other joy from me this joy shall tear,  
But, like pure incense, in my life shall stay—  
My Garden's Bloom.

Toronto.

T. G. MARQUIS.

THE *Herald* of June 3rd says: Strauss has captured Chicago. The city is his. During the winter months we have had an affluence of great musical treats. We have had Patti, Tamango, Albani, Lehmann, Perotti, and Reichmann. They were all delightful. But every blessed one of them felt it a duty to din into our ears the heaviest and most intricate music that was ever composed. . . . It has made us tired. The coming of Strauss, with his portfolio of exquisite popular melodies, is as refreshing as a mint julep. . . . There were 4,000 of us at the Auditorium last night. It was a hot night, but not one of us left until the last encore was played, and the tired musicians politely refused to play more. Subscribers' lists at Nordheimer's and Suckling's. The Brochures will be mailed by applying to Percival T. Greene, Manager Toronto Concerts.