

The Presbyterian Review.

NOTICES.

(1) Terms—In advance, \$2.00; after 3 months, \$1.50; after 6 months, \$1.00; after 9 months, \$0.50. (2) The number against the name on the tab upon the paper shows to what time the subscription is paid, and serves all the purposes of a receipt. Thus, "A. Jones, 93," means that A. Jones has paid to number 93, Review. At least two weeks are required after the receipt of money by us before the number on the tab can be changed. (3) When the address of a paper is changed, both the old and the new, including Post-office, County, and Province, should be given. ADVERTISING RATES—Per line per year, \$3.00; 6 months, \$1.50; 3 months, 75 cents; 1 month, 50 cents; under 1 month, 10 cents. Special rates for contracts on application. Subscribers failing to receive the "Review" promptly, will confer a favour by immediately notifying the Manager.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 9TH, 1886.

THE CENTRAL PRISON.

THE REVIEW SUSTAINED—MR. MASSIE DEMANDS THE WITHDRAWAL OF "SECRETARY" KORMAN.

IN reference to a pretended report of an interview between Mr. Hardy, the Provincial Secretary, and a Globe reporter as to a charge made in these columns that Roman Catholic pressure was being persistently exercised to drive Mr. Massie from the wardenship of the Central Prison, we stated that until Mr. Massie himself had explicitly denied the truth of this charge, no statement of the Globe or of the Provincial Secretary to the contrary could be accepted by the public as finally disposing of the matter. From what in the interim has appeared in the daily press our readers have seen what good grounds we had for urging this refusal. Mr. Massie, himself, to the utmost consternation of all who made haste to doubt the truth of our statements, and ventured to assail and vilify the Review, has in two letters, one an open letter to the city press, and the other an official letter to the Provincial Secretary, amply confirmed all that the Review has stated, and beyond all possible cavil established our complete vindication. The open letter is of date Sept. 1st, addressed to the city press, and copies we understand were left at the offices of the dailies, and was promptly published by all of them on the 2nd inst. except the Globe, which, for reasons best known to itself, but which may readily be conjectured, refused its admission to its columns until Monday last. The fair presumption is that the letter only too well supports those statements in the Review, which the Globe in its reckless folly denominated "lying rubbish." As no copy of the letter has reached this office we shall assume that its contents are intended to apply in all particulars only to those journals to which it was sent. But as it bears directly upon the charges made in the Review, we shall give it in full, taking the liberty to italicize certain parts of it to which we wish to draw special attention, and the full force of which might escape the cursory reader, or might be intentionally misinterpreted to our disadvantage as has already been done by the willing partisans. It is painfully evident that the letter is written under very strong pressure to make as good a case as possible for the Palace and its friends, and with the hope, which we trust will not be delusive, to secure if possible in this particular instance, a proof of that confidence which the Provincial Secretary says the Government feels to the Warden. But for the second letter to which we shall presently refer, we might express our regret that Mr. Massie is not sufficiently explicit to prevent all misconception, but it is to be remembered that he speaks as an official who has very recently been more than once sharply reminded that he is not the servant of the public but the servant of the Government, and as a man who is naturally and properly unwilling to break with party friends if haply by any means consistent with his duty to the public, the preservation of his dignity, and the approval of his conscience, he could succeed in preserving a locus standi between himself and them. Mr. Massie has been severely blamed by some of our friends for publishing such a guarded and almost ambiguous letter, and failing to tell the whole truth, but we do not blame him. In fact he could not well do otherwise. But here is the letter.

OPEN LETTER TO THE CITY PRESS.

Gentlemen—Kindly permit me through the medium of your columns, to say that some of the articles that have appeared in the city papers of late regarding matters connected with the Central Prison, especially in so far as they refer to the Government asking me to resign and to the Roman Catholic clergy interfering with myself personally or the workings of the institution, are not in all particulars correct. No member of the Government, as at present constituted, has ever asked for or hinted at my resignation to myself, and I have no reason now to think otherwise than that I have their entire confidence. As to the Roman Catholic clergy, those of them whose names appeared in the press as prominently connected with the late investigation do not now visit the prison, and I may say, in this connection, that a late change in the officiating priest, if not made for the purpose of establishing greater harmony between that body and myself, has, at least, placed one for the duties of the office, who is most acceptable to all the officers of the prison. I have no knowledge, personally, that the Archbishop is seeking to exercise any influence with the Government against me. It is very unpleasant, however, to be kept continually before the public, even though referred to in commendable terms. My desire now, as it has been from the first, is to discharge the duties devolving on me with profit to all individual and Provincial interests concerned, and I can best do that if left in peace to pursue the course my conscience approves in effecting improvements on the prison and its workings.

Sept. 1st, 1886. JAMES MASSIE, Warden. Lest at any time this letter should be quoted as contradicting anything that we have stated, we shall ask our readers to read over what we ourselves have said, not merely what the party papers represent us to have said, and note:— 1. Much of Mr. Massie's letter applies only to

the party newspapers that have taken up the matter. The Review has most carefully avoided entering upon the political hearing of the case. With this we have absolutely nothing whatever to do. The Review never stated or even hinted that the Government desired the Warden's resignation. What we feared, and what we expressed in our first article, was that they might consent to Mr. Massie's being squeezed out by Roman Catholic pressure. If we had been enemies of the Government we would, as we said, have waited until the thing was actually done. And every man who is not a violent party man agrees with us.

2. Attention is directed to the words "resign" and "resignation." We intimated in our first article that it was not intended that Mr. Massie's removal from the Wardenship of the Central Prison should be effected by his resignation, but that some other post was to be provided for him. The phrases "myself personally," and in "all particulars" conceal a world of meaning. These qualifications and limitations are, in the circumstances, most significant. To see the full force of them let the sentence be read without them. The pressure to have them eliminated must, we fancy, have been tremendous, but there they are still, and will ever remain a silent witness of the value of a good conscience in a trying emergency.

3. We shall not insult the intelligence of our readers by dwelling at length upon the statement:—

"A late change in the officiating priest, if not made for the purpose of establishing greater harmony between that body and myself, has, at least, placed one for the duties who is most acceptable to all the officers of the prison."

It clearly shows that the Roman Catholic priests did make trouble in the Central Prison, and that until very recently they were out of harmony with the Warden. But there is here no word of Mr. Korman, the alleged "Secretary," a Roman Catholic appointed immediately on the heels of the investigation, and the source of all the recent troubles.

4. Mr. Massie's statement that he has no knowledge personally that the Archbishop is seeking to exercise any influence with the Government against him, may be implicitly believed. It was hardly worth while to make such a statement. After all that came out at the investigation and all that was prevented from coming out, no sane man believes that the Palace is ignorant of the pressure kept upon Mr. Massie, or is in doubt as to its origin or object, though he may not see personally the Archbishop's hand.

5. The plea for peace to pursue the course his conscience approves in effecting improvements in the prison and its workings shows that the Warden has not been allowed to exercise his own judgment, and that the rumours of troubles fomented by the priests are only too well founded.

6. We sympathize with Mr. Massie in his unwillingness to have his name kept continually before the public, but Mr. Massie and the public on reflection will understand that it is not a mere name, however honourable, but a great principle that has been at stake. If this principle could have been asserted and its triumph secured without the introduction of names, no one could have been more pleased than ourselves; but we are sure that Mr. Massie will not grudge the annoyance, if his name has been the watchword in a struggle for the assertion of civil and religious liberty.

But the elucidation of the full meaning of the Warden's letter and its confirmation by implication of all the Review has stated, is rendered almost wholly unnecessary by the fact as stated in the daily press of last Saturday that Mr. Massie has addressed a letter to the Provincial Secretary demanding from the Government the removal of Mr. Korman, the agent of the Palace—the man whom we have not hesitated to call the Archbishop's spy. By this one act the Warden confirms all that we have said, and establishes beyond the possibility of cavil the existence of a great evil in the Central Prison, and the necessity for its immediate removal.

Our readers have now an opportunity of seeing what grounds we had for drawing public attention to the aggressiveness of Roman Catholicism in this Province, and the determination of the Palace to subordinate our public institutions to its own interests and aggrandizement. We trust that, now that Protestants in general, and Presbyterians in particular, see the danger that is impending, that they will make a determined stand against any further concessions to the Romish hierarchy. And we trust also that, the Government of the day having so recently expressed their confidence in the Warden, will consent to his most reasonable request and release him from that odious pressure which he has borne too long in their interest.

AN APPEAL TO CONSCIENCE.

IF our readers agreed with our remarks a fortnight ago, on the evils of partyism, they will see that a solemn responsibility rests upon the Christian press and the Christian pulpit with regard to this wretched party strife, which is doing much to blight the true growth of our country. We believe the existence of parties to be a necessary consequence of popular institutions, but we are convinced that unless they are subordinated to the advocacy of a policy men honestly believe to be for the welfare of the country, they become an unmitigated nuisance. When the tie which binds a party together is the sharing of the spoils of office, or the determination to obtain office, when the struggle is purely selfish and sordid, with no great principle at stake, and no thought of benefit to any but the faithful adherents of the party, then the strife is contemptible and makes even good and noble men contempt-

ible who come to the fore front of the battle. We can fancy a party formed such as is now proposed in the United States, to secure the amendment of the Constitution so as to prohibit entirely the manufacture and sale of intoxicants except for scientific and medical purposes, which would naturally attract good men into its ranks, and would tend to make those good who might be drawn in from interested or selfish motives. To such a party any man might count it an honour to belong, because the principle at stake is one for which a man might be content to give his life if that were necessary.

But what shall we say of our parties and their principles? Will any of our politicians be emboldened by their party warfare, or will the heart of the country be thrilled by the utterances of orators who have a message to deliver worthy of their powers, and who are fighting, not for the spoils of office, but for truth and righteousness? Attracted by the fame of some public speakers, we have attended some political meetings, where the whole evening was spent in the exchange of charges of corruption, and when the facts were too glaring to be boldly denied, they were amply met by counter charges of a more terrible kind. In the eyes of politicians two blacks make a white, and the all-sufficient answer to a charge of lying is the old and popular one "You're another."

But the party journals of our country are travelling, of course, in the same line as the politicians. They search with eagerness for every flaw in the character of opposing politicians. They fill their columns with stories of corruption practiced by members of parliament which they have accepted as true without any investigation. They appeal to the lowest and meanest motives in order to rouse party enthusiasm, but seldom, if ever, address their readers as though they were capable of true patriotism, or had any desire for the welfare of the country. If these papers had a policy to advocate instead of a party to support at all costs, they might do immense service to the country. And we are not without hope that better things may be looked for in some quarters at least in the days to come.

The demoralizing influence of this partyism is acknowledged on all hands, even politicians themselves being ready to admit privately that they are not satisfied with the state of affairs. But what is to be done, and how are the evils from which we suffer to be removed? Why, simply by teaching the politicians the full meaning of the Ten Commandments, by making it clearly understood that stealing out of the public purse is as worthy of the Central Prison as stealing from a private till, that bearing false witness against a neighbour is as worthy of condemnation when it comes from the lips of an orator on the public platform or the pen of a party editor, as when it is whispered into private ears for miserable private ends; that political honour should be as unimpeachable as private character, and political trickery as disgraceful as common cheating. Surely these are no utopian propositions in a country where the majority of our politicians are professing Christians, who have been led astray as far as some of them are concerned, only through blind allegiance to party. And when the teaching of the Ten Commandments is applied to politics, a large class of men who are a disgrace to the country will finally disappear—the political adventurers whose heaven towards which they are ever striving is a government appointment, and who are ready to undertake any deed of darkness which even their employers must publicly repudiate if only it bring them nearer to the goal they are seeking.

But not only would these wretched creatures disappear, but men of uprightness and of splendid ability would come forward to our parliaments, and by their presence strengthen and cheer the capable and noble men who are struggling now in apparent hopelessness. As things are at present good men are afraid to offer to serve their country, and if they did offer, would likely be defeated by the party machine. We remember an old politician in the West, when we expressed our regret that a mutual friend whom we highly esteemed had been defeated at the polls, saying: "I am not at all sorry, for he is far too good a man to send to parliament."

This of course was not sound reasoning, but it goes to show the drift of public opinion. We hope to point out in another article the effect of partyism on temperance legislation. In the meantime we invite correspondence on this matter, and will be glad of any suggestion which may help to stem the tide of evil coming upon us through this prevailing partyism.

LAW-ENFORCEMENT AND OUTRAGE.

THE acts of violence which have followed the successful attempts to enforce the punitive provisions of the Scott Act, have been no surprise to us. We expected the Act to pinch, and its victims to squirm, and it is no new partnership, that of liquor and crime. Intimidation has, of course, been the object; fire and dynamite are to paralyze effort to carry the law into effect. To the credit of the public officers be it said, the attempt to terrify is likely to prove a failure. Those previously faithful have shown no sign of backing down; and we mistake the spirit of the stalwart temperance men of our counties and cities, if outrages will turn them aside from their purpose.

It is well to remember that abuses die hard. Behind every abuse are men who live by it; behind many abuses, men who fasten by them. These will stand back only after a fight. The men who prosper by the liquor traffic are too many of them themselves its victims also, and

therefore brutalized and ready for vengeance and violence.

Personal assault has been one of the developments of the policy of outrage; but it is something to congratulate ourselves on, that no life has, as yet, been sacrificed. It has been different elsewhere. On the 3rd of August, in Sioux city, Iowa, Rev. George C. Haddock was deliberately shot dead, while crossing the public street, by one of a body of men waiting for him on the further side. It is said, on trustworthy testimony, that he was a pleasant and genial man, entirely without malice, and unvengeful. There was no old grudge. He had been little more than six months in the place and had peaceably attended to his ministerial duties. His one offence was a bold and determined effort to bring to justice the breakers of the prohibitory law of the State. This was enough. He must die. Things will not, we trust, come to this pass in Canada. But the uniformness with which attacks upon property and person have followed upon successful prosecutions under the Scott Act, reveal a policy of violence, which may bear yet more bitter fruit than it has already done. There is in almost every community one at least among the liquor dealers who will resort to extreme measures. There are characterless men, too, who, made reckless by drink, will stop at nothing. We are not alarmists: but we wish to clear our skirts by pointing out the dangers which we plainly see.

It is lamentable that in none of the recent cases of violence have the perpetrators been brought to justice. Rewards have been offered by the local authorities, but thus far without result. The approaching convention in Toronto should make the strongest representations concerning this matter to the Ontario Government. The Scott Act is not a provincial law; but it is surely the bounden duty of the local government to aid in the detection and suppression of outrage. Inaction of the government means a premium on lawbreaking. We are persuaded that a government which has given the country an excellent license law, and which has shown itself friendly to the Scott Act, will not recede at this crisis from the advanced position it has taken in regard to temperance. Even if it wanted license, or wanted free liquor, it is bound to preserve order and to protect the lives and property of citizens.

The Dominion Government also should hear from the convention. It has declined to pass the amendments necessary to the full success of the Scott Act. It has appropriated the fines accruing from prosecutions under the Act, and notwithstanding repeated calls on the part of the temperance community, has refused thus far to make them available, as in simple justice they ought to be, for the working of the Act. The convention can afford to speak firmly. The Ontario and the Dominion Governments could each of them be overthrown by the concerted action of temperance electors. These electors have been patient. There comes a time when patience ceases to be a virtue.

Pressure is urgently needed, too, in another direction. The confusion which exists in counties under the Scott Act where there are no police magistrates, is largely due to county councils refusing to bear the expenses of such magistrates. January will bring an opportunity of dealing with the reeves and their deputies. The temperance vote is spineless indeed if it does not deal very summarily with them; and the convention can do no better work than organize for effective action through the municipal bodies.

It is in place here to rally all good men to the help of those officers who are trying to carry out the law, and for the displacement of those who are not. Sioux city bears the stain of the blood of George Haddock, because of the apathy of a large portion of its citizens towards the prohibitory law and the positive antagonism of not a few of those in prominent positions. Some of our towns are aping this unfortunate city. Let them continue such a course, and we know not what results may ensue. It is the part of all order-loving citizens to pronounce distinctly for the enforcement of law and to render all aid in their power to those whose duty brings them into close quarters with unscrupulous law-breakers.

[Since the above was written it is announced that the Dominion Government has decided that all moneys received in fines for infractions of the Scott Act are to be passed over to the Provincial Governments in future.]

CHINESE REPRISALS.

OUR readers no doubt still remember with horror the accounts of the massacre of innocent and inoffensive Chinamen by United States citizens at Rock Springs last year. One result of that atrocity has appeared in a very unexpected quarter. More than fifteen hundred miles up the Yang-Tse-Kiang River, in the Province of Szechuen, the American Methodist church has had till lately a most prosperous mission. But news of the Rock Springs slaughter somehow reached this mission outpost, and the mob was roused to retaliation. The mission buildings were soon levelled, and the missionaries themselves driven out.

We do not wonder at what has happened; and it is hard to blame the Chinese, when we reflect on their general moderation in comparison with the fiendish cruelty of the American mob. The Chinese spared life, while the Americans by shooting and burning sacrificed over fifty men who had been guilty of no crime except that modern one, of being willing to work for small wages. Doubtless, China will be compelled to pay indemnity for the destruction of property, but she can never pay, nor can the United