

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
The True Witness Printing & Publishing Co.
(LIMITED)
353 St. James Street, Montreal, Canada.
P. O. Box 1138.

MS. and all other communications intended for publication or notice, should be addressed to the Editor, and all business and other communications to the Managing Director, True Witness P. & P. Co., Ltd., P. O. Box 1138.

The Subscription price of True Witness or City, Great Britain, Ireland and France, is \$1.50.

Belgium, Italy, Germany and Australia, \$2.00. Canada, United States and Newfoundland, \$1.00. Terms payable in advance.

New subscriptions can commence at any time during the year.

Money for renewal and new subscriptions should be sent to Managing Director, P. O. Box 1138.

You may remit by bank cheque, post office money order, express money order or by registered letter. Silver sent through the mail is liable to wear a hole through the envelope and be lost.

We are not responsible for money lost through the mail.

Discontinuance.—Remember that the publisher must be notified by letter when a subscriber wishes his paper stopped. All arrears must be paid.

Returning your paper will not enable us to discontinue it, as we cannot find your name on our books unless your post office address is given.

The date opposite your name on the margin of your paper shows you up to what time your subscription is paid.

We recognize the friends of True Witness by the prompt manner in which they pay their subscriptions.

Always give the name of the post office to which your paper is sent. Your name cannot be found on our books unless this is done.

When you wish your address changed, write us in time, giving your old address as well as your new one.

If you fail to receive your paper regularly, notify us at once by letter or postal.

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5, 1896

A PATRIOT PARLIAMENT.

If you asked an Irish student of Irish History to what gathering above all others that met in Ireland for the making of laws, from the year 1172 till the Union of 1801, it would be most in accordance with historic truth to apply the name of Patriot Parliament, his answer would in all likelihood be "Grattan's Parliament." And, assuredly, for the time and circumstances, it was a great triumph when Grattan carried his address declaring Ireland's independence. Not without reason did that great spokesman of Ireland's cause exclaim in the tumult of emotion excited by his victory: "I found Ireland on her knees; I watched over her with a paternal solicitude, I have traced her progress from injury to arms, from arms to liberty. Spirit of Swift! Spirit of Molyneux! Your genius has prevailed! Ireland is now a nation! in that new character I hail her! and bowing to her august presence, I say, 'Eato perpetua!'" There were lawyers, indeed, who maintained that England's response to Ireland's assertion of independence—namely, the repeal of the Declaratory Act of George I—was not explicit enough as a renunciation of the right, if right there were, to legislate for Ireland; but to cast doubt on the constitution would have revived a dangerous agitation, and while England adhered to the understanding, every one had to be satisfied. The discussion of the Regency bill indicated a possible source of danger to the connection but the King's recovery made it merely momentary. No human arrangement is perfect, and, although the Parliament that bears Grattan's name was, by the irony of fate, the destined preliminary to the Union, and was not without grave essential drawbacks, it gave Ireland that political and commercial freedom which had been so sorely needed and so strongly yearned for, and, but for the evil of dissension among the leaders, might ultimately have conferred the great boon of religious freedom as well. Looking back at that Parliament to-day, and bearing in mind that it was composed of Protestants, one cannot help feeling that the prospects of "emancipation" from a body so constituted were anything but cheering, and that, had the opposition to the Union scheme prevailed, Irish Catholics might again and again have endured the anguish of hope deferred in a matter so dear to their hearts. The Relief bill of 1793 was, indeed, something like a guarantee of the intentions of the more generous-minded members of that Protestant Parliament, and it might have been possible, by good management eventually to give seats to a majority favorable to Catholic claims. The Relief measure of 1793 was certainly a marked advance on the Penal Laws. It abolished some of the most vexatious distinctions of that cruel regime. Our forefathers had the elective franchise, but they could only elect Protestants, as Catholics had no seat in the Legislature; and as for the other rights that the law restored them—of serving in the army and navy, of being jurors in both kinds, of carrying arms, of obtaining degrees in the university, etc.—the very mention of them arouses indignation as reminding us that generations of Irish Catholics were deprived of such rights. Nevertheless, the victory, as it was deemed, gave great satisfaction and inspired hope of a

grander triumph that would leave no just aspiration of national pride unfulfilled.

But after everything has been said for Grattan's Parliament, it is to an earlier assembly that we must refer if we seek in Ireland's Parliamentary annals for the true model of a National Feis that satisfied every claim, so far as religious liberty is concerned. Most historians have discussed the Parliament of 1689 from the standpoint of their prejudices or have hastily dismissed it as of minor importance compared with more stirring events of that period of disquiet. Lecky, Froude, McGee, Walpole, Macaulay, J. H. McCarthy, and other historians, have all dealt with it with at least sufficient fullness to permit the reader to infer whether their sentiments are in sympathy or antagonism with its legislation. Of the whole of that legislation none of them approve, and none of them entirely approve of James the Second and his house. The Irish people have no great reason to revere his memory, and the epithet that is sometimes attached to his name in their native speech is more vigorous than polite. Nevertheless, the Parliament of 1689 was a grand experiment. It was to be expected from the character of the struggle in which James and his son-in-law were engaged that most of those who sided with His Majesty in Ireland would be Catholics. Nevertheless, Protestants were admitted into both Houses. If there were only a few of them in the House of Lords, it was because they were absent or otherwise engaged, not because their presence was forbidden. As it was, Protestant prelates and lay peers sat in the upper house with the heads of noble Catholic families. The Bishop of Meath, Dr. Anthony Downing, and the Earl of Longford and Granard, carried on a vigilant opposition which was not wanting in boldness. There were at least six Protestants in the Commons, two of whom sat for the University. Of the legislation of this Parliament we are mainly concerned with two features—by one of which its own independence was secured, while the other established liberty of conscience and freedom of worship. Supplemental to these were acts declaring Ireland judicially independent and abolishing writs of error and appeal to England, and obliging all persons to pay tithes only to the clergy of their own communion. A measure repealing Poyning's Law was defeated by the King's interference. With the mere controversial elements in the legislation of the Irish Parliament of 1689 we need not meddle at present. McGee has condemned what he considered arbitrary, unjust or vindictive on the King's part, but he sums up the general character of the proceedings in these words: "Whatever may be the bias of historians, it cannot be denied that this Parliament showed a spirit worthy of the representatives of a free people." The best history of it—indeed, the only history of it that is worthy of the name—is that which was written by Thomas Davis, more than fifty years ago, and republished a few years since with a careful introduction by Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, as a volume of the New Irish Library, prepared and issued by the two Irish Literary Societies of London and Dublin. Mr. Lecky, in the second volume of his "History of England in the Eighteenth Century" says of Davis' monograph: "By far the best and fullest account of this Parliament with which I am acquainted is to be found in a series of papers (which have unfortunately never been reprinted) by Thomas Davis, in the Dublin Magazine of 1843. In these papers the Acts of Repeal and Attainder are printed at length, and the extant evidence relating to them is collected and sifted with an industry and skill that leave little to be desired. I must take this opportunity of expressing my grateful thanks to Sir Gavan Duffy for having called my attention to these most valuable but now almost forgotten papers." With Sir Gavan Duffy's introduction, Davis' essay on "The Patriot Parliament of 1689" forms a contribution to Irish history which no Irish student of his country's annals ought to neglect reading.

Mr. JAMES WHITE, for many years president of the Capital Lacrosse Club, is one of the principal organizers of the demonstration to be tendered to Premier Laurier in Ottawa this evening. If Mr. White has worked half as enthusiastically in connection with the demonstration to the Premier as he did in the past in connection with the National game in Ottawa, it will be a splendid success.

The Daily Witness, under the title "Lachine Canal Superintendent," refers to a rumor which has been circulated, that certain friends of the Liberal party were endeavoring to have Mr. Conway dismissed, on the grounds that he had interfered in the recent elections and used his influence to advance the cause of the Conservatives. The Daily Witness pays a very high tribute to Mr. Conway for the able manner in which he has discharged the duties of his office, and deprecates the idea of any official being made suffer through having evinced any

desire to interest himself in the national affairs of his country. We have it on the most reliable authority that Mr. Conway abstained from taking any part whatever in any of the contests in this city, and that the present agitation to secure his removal is simply due to the fact that some of the anxious placers have an eye on his position.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE AND ARBITRATION.

In the year 1820 the course of events had simultaneously directed the attention of the United States and Great Britain to certain dangers that seemed to threaten the recently liberated American Provinces of Spain. After the great readjustment of 1815, the Emperor Alexander the First of Russia, who had been a prominent figure among the sovereigns who contributed to the overthrow of the Napoleonic system, undertook to use his influence in the establishment of such a European concert as would prevent the renewal of warfare. It had been suggested to his majesty, by a lady who exercised no little control over his mind, that the policy of nations ought to be in harmony with the principles of the Gospel, and that if the great powers united in an agreement to put their Christianity in practice, the result would be most beneficial to themselves and to the world at large. Alexander succeeded in persuading the Emperor of Austria and the King of Prussia to join him in a league, which, from its aims, was called the Holy Alliance. Although the map of Europe, as reconstructed by Napoleon Bonaparte, had been, in the main, restored to the condition in which it had been before the Revolutionary wars, the revolution had to a considerable extent modified the ideas of statesmen and even of monarchs. There was a craze for written constitutions, solemn agreements between kings and their subjects. The Holy Alliance seemed at first to be imbued with the spirit of liberal reform and to have the rights of the people very much at heart. But, however well-meaning they may have been, they could not divest themselves of the traditional prejudices of sovereignty. They wished whatever liberties they granted the people to be regarded as proceeding from their sacred prerogative, and any attempt to claim them as rights they considered Jacobinism. Gradually the sentiment of royalty proved too strong for the new-born fervor for democracy, and before its course was ended the Holy Alliance became a league of sovereigns united for interests of their own exclusively. As the years went by and other impressions of the revolutionary era had less force, their majesties and their policies on old models, and rumors of many kinds of restoration were daily heard. Among the princes of the house of Bourbon that had profited by the revival of the *status quo ante* was Ferdinand the Seventh of Spain. Of all the powers of Europe none had suffered greater loss of domain than Spain by the outbursts of popular aspiration that followed the triumph of the Revolution. In two centuries, it is true, the realm which had once wielded so wide a sway in both hemispheres had been sinking deeper and deeper into the slough of political despair, until at last the pompous manner of Spanish ambassadors was in absurd contrast to the lack of power and wealth that lay behind it. As long as Spain was mistress of five-sixths of the new world, there was some excuse for an assumption of majesty that had some basis of reality. But when, one after another, her vice royalties and captaincies and provinces were wrested from her enfeebled hands by the determined efforts of well-led insurgents, those airs of oriental state were out of place. The successive steps of Spain's descent from the throne of power and pride that she had occupied at the close of the 15th century would be interesting to follow in the pages of universal history, and they certainly form a remarkable chapter. Such a chapter would also comprise a considerable part of the history of Europe and America, and would bring on the scene some of the greatest statesmen, soldiers and ecclesiastics of three pregnant centuries.

The causes to which Spain owed the loss of her hold on the new world existed before the Revolution, but it was the wide-spread unrest that ensued on the success of the great revolt in France that prepared the way for the catastrophe. The romance of Spanish exploration and conquest, which is so fascinating in the pages of Prescott and other historians, ought not to blind our eyes to the cruelty and oppression of Spanish rule. Neither ought we to ignore the brighter passages of Spanish domination such as the noble self devotion of Las Casas and other missionaries, nor the learning that has given the world so many rich treasures of historical knowledge. If in the north, Jacques Cartier, Lescarbot, Champlain, and the members of the Jesuit, Recollet and Sulpician Orders have left us volume after volume of most valuable information touching the condition and events of New France in the 16th and 17th centuries, the secular clergy and religious orders who accompanied the Conquistadors

have filled the archives of old and new Spain with precious tomes not to be found elsewhere. Robertson, Irving, Prescott, and the more critical later writers on Spanish America, could have made little advance but for the rare sources of first hand knowledge to which the Spanish authorities gave them access. We can hardly wonder if it was with extreme reluctance that Spanish kings and ministers allowed events in their Cis-Atlantic Empire to take their course and recognized the independence of the provinces on which, with whatever mistakes of judgment or faults of heart, they had expended so much thought and care. It is not surprising, therefore, that when the Holy Alliance set about its task of monarchical restoration, the rulers of Spain should have asked whether nothing could be done in the way of bringing back their revolted colonies to a sense of their alliance to the motherland. George the Third had been very slow in acknowledging the right of his American colonies to throw off the yoke. Nothing but the stern arbitrament of the sword could convince him that they were not to be won back to the yoke that he had discarded. But in the time of President Monroe's administration, the Revolutionary war had been followed by another needless quarrel and the war of 1812 by a peace which, it was hoped, would prove lasting. The old King had gone to his long home and the two countries were fairly friendly. When it was rumored that there was a design on the part of the Holy Alliance to assist Spain to recover her lost possessions, the President of the United States conceived the idea of entering into a compact with Great Britain to oppose the *Dreibund* of that period and to defend the newly emancipated colonies from interference. Mr. Adams suggested another course, which was followed, and so the Monroe Doctrine was formulated as a perennial platform of foreign policy for American statesmen. In the course of time, by the irony of fate, that doctrine was to be invoked against the ally of 1823.

In the year 1499 a fleet of Spanish vessels from the harbor of Cadiz, commanded by a brave Castilian named Alonso de Ojeda, after cruising up and down the coast from the mouth of the Oronoco to the Isthmus of Panama, at last entered the estuary of Maracaybo. Amerigo Vespucci, who was aboard of one of the ships, was reminded by the pile-sustained villages of the natives of the familiar scenes of Venice with its captive waters, and the name of Little Venice (Venezuela) came to his lips. Ojeda was made governor of that stretch of coast and he called it Andalusia, but to the English speaking world it is better known as the Spanish Main. For nearly a quarter of a millennium it acknowledged the sovereignty of Spain, and then there came the crisis already referred to, when one by one, or sometimes several at once, the colonies of Spain cast off the yoke. Miranda, who had fought under Washington, raised the standard of revolt in 1805, and, though he failed, others took up the cause of freedom, and in 1811 a republic was declared. A struggle of ten years ended in the expulsion of the Spaniards. For some years Simon Bolivar, who shares with another great patriot the honorable title of Liberator, ruled a republic composed of Venezuela, New Granada and Ecuador. Disintegration followed his death and Venezuela started on its career as an independent State. It has an area of some 600,000 square miles, one of the grandest river systems in the world, a coast line of some 2,000 miles, and resources of great variety and value. Venezuela has for neighbors the Guianas, British, Dutch and French, and between the republic and the British colony there is a dispute of long standing touching a region in which gold mining is carried on. The attention of civilization was somewhat abruptly called to this territory some six months ago by a message from President Cleveland to the Marquis of Salisbury of an arbitrary character. Good is sometimes developed out of evil, and if a permanent plan for the peaceful settlement of disputes between the British Empire and the United States should be the ultimate result of the controversy, it will be one stage nearer to that

"Parliament of man, the Federation of the world," which is the goal of the Laureate's dream.

A DECISION by the New York Court of Appeals has caused a great deal of comment. The judges, practically speaking, ruled that if a person loses his bank book the man who finds it has a right to go to the bank and draw out every cent of the deposit, and there is no redress or recovery. If the judgment has been correctly reported, to say the least it is a peculiar one.

In Protestant Germany this year, for the first time since the "Reformation," a public procession on Corpus Christi Day has taken place, while in France the Archbishop of Cambria was again in trouble through insisting on holding the procession in opposition to municipal authority.

THE TWO PLATFORMS.

There are certain considerations which make the present Presidential campaign in the United States of considerable importance to Canada. The history of parties in the great Republic may be said to have begun with the discussions between Hamilton and Jefferson in Washington's first administration. The germs of conflict already existed, indeed, before his inauguration—the country being divided into two large factions known as Federalists and anti-Federalists. As they both united in choosing Washington as the nation's first President, there was nothing like a presidential campaign in 1788. Washington's cabinet was nevertheless a coalition cabinet in so far as it contained elements that had been hostile to each other. What was of more importance, they remained hostile and no two leaders of opposing parties could be more distinctly pitted against each other than were Thomas Jefferson and Alexander Hamilton. These dissensions in his cabinet caused much distress to the President, but before he retired from public life, he had personal reasons to deplore the growth of party spirit, for in spite of his services to the Republic, Washington was frequently assailed with a coarseness and bitterness which must inspire resentment even to read of. His farewell address is full of pathos, as implying a forecast of evils due perhaps to his own mistakes. Jefferson, who was president from 1801 to 1809, is looked upon as the founder of the Democratic party. It was not, however, till Andrew Jackson's time that the party of Jefferson assumed the name of Democrats. Their opponents, at first called Federalists, afterwards National Republicans, then, from 1834 to 1852, Whigs, were at last, after a few years of disintegration into several incoherent groups, united into a strong compact organization under their present name. The first Republican convention, after the reconstruction of the party, was held at Philadelphia in 1856, when Fremont and Dayton were nominated for President and Vice-President respectively. They were defeated. President Buchanan's administration was a period of evident preparation for a great struggle, which was precipitated by the election of Abraham Lincoln, over three competitors, Douglas, Breckenridge and Bell. Notwithstanding the war, the tragedy of Lincoln's death, the impeachment of Andrew Johnson, and a series of troubles that attended the pacification of the emancipated South, the Republicans held the reins of power until the election of President Cleveland in 1884. In 1888 President Harrison was the choice of the majority and four years later Mr. Cleveland was again elected the Republic's chief magistrate. Every quadrennial election since 1856 has had its peculiar features, and those who are old enough to remember the civil war and the discussions that preceded and followed it need not be told how materially the party platforms have changed since Lincoln's election. The most regrettable outcome of a partisanship that has survived the principles of the party displaying it is that, when neither theory nor practice offers fair ground of division subjects that ought never to be brought into the arena of party warfare are selected as *casus belli*, and such differences as exist regarding them are enlarged or misrepresented until reconciliation seems impossible. Even the burning question of slavery, which was the great stumbling block to harmonious deliberation on matters of common interest between the two main sections of the Republican party, as now constituted, entered on its career, could, it was believed, have been settled without bloodshed but for the exaggerations and misrepresentations of demagogues. There were Americans who firmly believed that, had the negotiations been wisely conducted, there was no more insurmountable obstacle to the peaceful extinction of slavery in the United States than there had been in the West Indies. In like manner the character of a purely business character, related on the one hand to revenue, and, on the other, to the encouragement of home industries, instead of being dealt with impartially by experienced men according to the condition and requirements of the country, has been made the foot-ball of warring parties, now sent up to an extravagant height and again dropped almost to zero, as one or other side prevailed.

In the platform of both parties the tariff is looked at from a purely traditional standpoint. The Republicans charge their opponents with the sacrifice of needed revenue, thus necessitating deficits and loans, and augmenting the public debt, causing panics and prolonged depression by the interruption of many branches of industry. They appeal to their own record in power as a record of revived prosperity, of taxes on foreign goods and encouragement to home industry, of securing the American producer a constant and profitable market and of making the American farmer less dependent on foreign control and domestic monopoly. Without being pledged to any particular schedules, the Republicans promise to uphold the principle of protection, the details to be governed by the conditions of the time and of produc-

tion. Along with protection, they would make provision for reciprocity on a basis advantageous to both nations concerned. Thus, while by protection they would build up domestic industry and trade, by reciprocity they would find an outlet for the country's surplus production. The Democrats, on the other hand, adhere to the principles of a revenue tariff—the duties being so adjusted as to discriminate neither for or against any particular class or section. At present, however, and until the money question is settled, they are against agitation for further tariff changes, save such as may be necessary to compensate for the adverse decision of the Supreme Court on the income tax.

The question of the money standard, and the free coinage of silver is undoubtedly the essential issue in the present contest. And, although the platforms of the two chief parties are antagonistic on this head, neither platform is quite satisfactory to all the members of the party which it claims to represent. There are silverites in the ranks of the Republicans. Indeed, major McKinley, the Republican candidate, was until a short time ago looked upon as one of the champions of free silver coinage. The late ex-Governor Russell, on the contrary, denounced any departure from the gold basis as immoral, unpatriotic, unbusiness like and wholly inconsistent with the best traditions of the Democratic party. "For one," he wrote just before his death, "I believe that our country's honor demands scrupulous fidelity to her plighted word, honest payment of her obligations, and that the peoples' interest is best served by strictly upholding here the gold standard of the civilized world." Only on one condition does the Republican platform admit that free silver coinage would be either judicious, profitable to the nation or morally justifiable—that is, by international agreement with the leading commercial nations of the world. Until such an agreement is possible, the Republicans hold that the gold standard must be preserved. The Democrats, while regarding the money question as of supreme importance at the present stage in the national development, are strongly opposed to mono-metallicism as un-American. With a gold standard, they deem it a British policy, the adoption of which has brought other nations into financial servitude to London. Its effect in the United States is, they believe, to keep the property of an industrial people locked up, while morally it stifles the love of liberty and undoes the work of the Revolution. Therefore, the Democrats demand the free and unlimited coinage of both silver and gold at the ratio of 16 to 1 without waiting for the consent or aid of any other nation. They would make the standard silver dollar a full legal tender, equally with gold, for all debts, public or private, and they would, by legislation, prevent the demonetization hereafter of any kind of legal money by private contract.

On some minor points both platforms are agreed. They are alike ready to uphold the Monroe Doctrine. They are nominally both in favor of an honest enforcement of the civil service law—the Democrats being, however, opposed to life tenure. They are in the main at one as to the payment of pensions to deserving veterans of the Civil War. They would both put restrictions on immigration. In excluding, by extension of the law's provisions, those who cannot read or write, the Republicans doubtless refer only to Europeans, as but such a ground few Chinese or Japanese would be affected. The Democrat platform condemns arbitrary interference with State rights. The Republicans urge a return to the free homestead policy. Both favor the admission of Territories with the least possible delay. The Republicans devote a special section to the rights and interests of women. They have also a word for Alaska, to whose citizens they would give representation in Congress.

Such are the chief points of likeness and unlikeness between the two platforms. On two points affecting other nations, they both hold virtually the same views—the Monroe Doctrine and checks on immigration. On two other points they are widely at variance—the tariff and the money question. But, on this last question there is a secession from each party, and as we have seen, one of the strongest and ablest Democrats of his generation condemned almost with his party's platform.

AMERICAN physicians are largely responsible for the increased use of all kinds of liquor among American women, says one of our contemporaries. They prescribe stimulants in a large number of cases of invalidism among women, with the inevitable result that, whether salutary or not for the sick, the habit grows among the healthful.

The old men are becoming victims to the bicycle craze, which has now taken possession of this city. It is a consolation, however, to dwell upon the thought that the new fad for the old men will share the fate of the one which made a number of them wear a blanket suit some years ago.