

The Catholic Record
Published every Friday morning at 466 Richmond Street.
THOS. COFFEY,
Proprietor and Publisher.
Annual subscription..... \$2.00
Six months..... 1.00
Arrears must be paid before the paper can be stopped.

LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSH.
London, Ont., May 23, 1878.
DEAR MR. COFFEY.—As you have become proprietor and publisher of the CATHOLIC RECORD, I deem it my duty to announce to its subscribers and patrons that the change of proprietorship will work no change in its one and principles; that it will remain, what it has been, thoroughly Catholic, entirely independent of political parties, and exclusively devoted to the cause of the Church and to the promotion of Catholic interests. I am confident that under your experienced management the RECORD will improve in usefulness and efficiency; and I therefore earnestly commend it to the patronage and encouragement of the clergy and laity of the diocese.
Believe me,
Yours very sincerely,
+ JOHN WALSH,
Bishop of London.

Mr. THOMAS COFFEY
Office of the "Catholic Record."

Catholic Record.

LONDON, FRIDAY, AUG. 4, 1882.

DOWNING STREET HEARD FROM.

We made reference a short time ago to the rumored action of the British government in censuring the Canadian government and Parliament for the address on Irish grievances passed by the latter body at its last session. The rumor of any such action on the part of the Downing Street authorities was at first received with some doubt. Many honest loyal Canadians could not be made credit a report so very discreditable to a government they always revered. We must, however, for our part, in fairness admit that we were disposed from the beginning to feel no surprise if the report were confirmed. Long years of perusal of documents emanating from Downing Street had prepared us for the rebuff just dealt out to the Canadian Parliament by Lord Kimberly. That "colonists have no rights" seems to be the motto of the noble lord as it has been of his predecessors. Lord Kimberly says: "Her Majesty will always gladly receive the advice of the Parliament of Canada on all matters relating to the Dominion and the administration of its affairs." Wonderful condescension! Downing street, know ye all, loyal Canadians, will henceforth gladly receive advice from your representatives on all matters affecting Canada! But Lord Kimberly continues: "In respect to the questions referred to in the address, Her Majesty will, in accordance with the constitution of this country, have regard to the advice of the Imperial Parliament and ministers, to whom all matters relating to the affairs of the United Kingdom exclusively appertain." No one that we know of in Canada is desirous of interfering with any matter exclusively pertaining to the Imperial government, but the Irish question is not one of these. It directly interests and affects every portion of the empire, and no portion more directly than Canada. The peace, growth and prosperity of Canada are all, as the colonial office well knows, vitally concerned in the adjustment of the Irish difficulty. The truth is that the enlightened action of the Canadian Parliament so far transcending the cruel and despotic course of the British Commons in matters Irish, was the hardest blow ever given the repressive policy so long and disastrously pursued by the Imperial government towards Ireland. The Gladstone Cabinet felt bitterly the position in which the address from both Houses of the Canadian Legislature placed them, and resolved to assume the old tone dictatorial to which the colonial office is so well accustomed. But insolence and insult cannot be accepted by the world as a satisfactory, much less a statesmanlike, response to the respectful representations of a Parliament not inferior in point of respectability or merit to the Parliament of Britain. We do not know what will be the reply of the Canadian government to Lord Kimberly's despatch, but we hope it will be a firm and expressive declaration of the right of the Parliament of Canada to pronounce its views on matters such as those referred to in the Costigan resolutions. Canadians of all classes must feel that if Lord Kimberly is to draw sharp lines as to the interference of one legislative body in the empire with matters under the control of another, there is very little coming within the scope of our legislation in which the

Imperial government can rightfully be permitted to interfere. Canadians look upon the empire as one whole in the prosperity of which each of the component parts is interested. If any portion pursues a policy hurtful to another or to the interests of the whole, any other portion or all others have the right to advise and remonstrate with its administration against continuance in such a course. If this be not the position of those portions of the British empire enjoying legislative independence, not one of them can be said to hold any other position than that of a mere subject or tributary district to a dominant nation. The Times evidently looks upon the colonies in this light. "Our colonies," it declares with an awful solemnity that will but arouse mingled feelings of contempt, defiance and ridicule on this side of the Atlantic, "Our colonies owe us a great deal and make a remarkably poor return. We nurse them through their pining infancy, insure for their youth an opportunity for tranquil, undisturbed growth, and our reward usually is, that as soon as they reach something approaching manhood they display independence by putting prohibitive, restrictive taxes on our commerce." The student of Canadian history will feel amused at this claim to nursing set up by the Times. We well know what manner of nursing Canada received at the hands of Britain from the conquest till the rebellion of 1837. Under such nursing a less healthful and vigorous infant would have perished at a most innocently early age. It is often a matter of wonder that, when, in spite of harshness, neglect and cruelty, Canada did reach maturity, it contented itself with a demand for a mere partial concession of right, such as responsible government. The American colonists, who, in 1776, severed the connection with Britain, had received far less provocation than the Canadians have had to endure. But Canada remained attached to the connection with Britain and is likely to remain so for sometime longer, till such ministers as Lord Kimberly so far outrage Canadian feeling and self-respect as to render separation desirable. That day may come too soon for the Times and for the colonial office. The Times says we expect the Imperial authorities to defend us and that we accordingly regulate their fleets and armies. As far as Canada is concerned, Britain has never shown any great eagerness to defend it when assailed, and the Dominion has nothing whatever to do in the regulation of the British fleets and armies. The Times also demands respect and courtesy from the colonies. They have never acted in any other spirit towards the parent state, and never will, even when the relations between both are very materially changed. But the Times must be made to understand, and the Earl of Kimberly must be made to understand, that while courteous and respectful at all times, Canadians never will be servile.

PERSONAL.

We deeply regret to learn that the Rev. Father O'Donovan, of St. Vincent's Church, Detroit, has been compelled by failing health to seek the restorative air of his native land. Under any other circumstances we should rejoice to see our rev. friend undertake such a voyage, and now hope that he may, in the old land, soon secure much of that strength he has spent for the promotion of religion in the diocese of Detroit. Rev. Father Frank O'Brien assumes pastoral charge of St. Vincent's during the absence of Father O'Donovan.

Rev. Father Van Antwerp replaces Rev. Father Vandyke at St. Aloysius Church, Detroit, during the temporary absence of the latter. Father Vandyke's many friends will rejoice to hear of his speedy return to health.

We are happy to state that the rumored appointment of Mr. Mathew F. Walsh, of Quebec, to the private secretaryship of the Hon. Mr. Costigan, has proved correct. We wish our friend a long career of usefulness and success in the public service of Canada.

PAYMENT OF MEMBERS.

We are happy to perceive that the question of paying the representatives of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament a fixed indemnity is taking definite shape. There can be no doubt that if the Irish people desire to secure fair, adequate and effective representation, they must provide for the payment of their members. When it is known that candidates for Parliamentary honors in the British Isles have to bear themselves the expenses of the election, that the government grants no indemnity whatever to members, and that the duration of the session is generally six or seven months, it will be readily understood that none but wealthy men can safely ask the people for their suffrages. Yet, strange to say, the majority of Irish members of Parliament are not only not wealthy but really poor men. Many of them are compelled while attending to their legislative duties to devote themselves to journalism and other kindred occupations to earn a livelihood. This is not certainly as it should be. The Irish representatives are amongst the most assiduous in the discharge of their trust. Their regular attendance throughout the sessions under difficulties of no ordinary character, is to them and to their constituents most creditable. It is, however, well known that many men of patriotic views and eminent qualifications for Parliamentary life are debarred from seeking that honor by the pecuniary embarrassment it necessarily entails, and that the attendance of Irish members, creditable as it is, is not as regular and as well maintained as it would be under an altered system, securing for them a reasonable indemnity. Those who have followed the proceedings in Parliament for the last two or three years especially, will readily acknowledge that the constant attendance of Irish members is a matter of the very first importance if legislation for Ireland is to be shaped according to the wishes of its people. No one can deny that had Mr. Parnell seventy five or eighty followers in Parliament, upon whose attendance he could count his position would be greatly improved and strengthened. With a handful of supporters he has been able to do much, but no one knows better than the Irish leader that the smallness of the number of those rallying around him in each discussion and on each division contributed largely to his inability to arrest the destructive legislation of the British Parliament. Besides the real positive good certain to result to the country itself by the adoption of a scheme securing a just and reasonable indemnity for its representatives, it is, we hold, a matter of right to compensate men who devote their time and talents to the interests of their country. It is all very well to say that if one man is unwilling to serve without pay another can be easily got who will gladly do so. If this view were acted upon either in Canada or the United States, we should have a very inferior and inefficient body of representatives in our legislatures. Acted upon, as it is in Great Britain and Ireland, it unduly restricts the representation to certain classes depriving the people of the full freedom the constitution designed to confer on them in the selection of their Parliamentary representatives. A very large number, so very large as to be utterly disproportionate, of the members of the present Commons of Great Britain, belongs to the aristocratic classes, which, through the House of Lords, enjoy co-ordinate powers of legislation with those of the people. We have no fault to find with constituencies that freely choose aristocratic representatives, but there can be no doubt that many scions of noble families holding seats in the Commons owe their election not to merit or capacity but to the depths and fullness of their purses. It is particularly important for the Irish people to select representatives honestly devoted, whether rich or poor, to the promotion of their welfare. In the present state of Irish society many of those best qualified to devote their time and energies to their country are, owing to the large pecuniary outlay required to secure

and hold a seat in Parliament, prevented from doing so. We are, therefore, very happy to see the public mind awakening to the importance of the indemnity question and would rejoice to see the movement taken hold of so ardently by many disinterested Irishmen put into actual working order before the next general election.

DEFEATED.

M. de Freycinet has been ignominiously defeated, and has accordingly handed in his resignation to President Grevy. We cannot say that we regret the fall of this very feeble-minded administration. It was, in certain respects, an improvement on its predecessor, its leader being a less objectionable man than M. Gambetta. But the improvement was very slight indeed. From the Gambetta administration the church had little to expect—from that of M. de Freycinet the friends of religion looked for protection at least from the insults and indecencies of radicalism left loose. They reckoned, however without reason. The cabinet did not of itself initiate any of the disgraceful irreligious measures that have for some months occupied the attention of French legislators, to the disgrace of the French race and the scandal of Christendom. But if it did nothing in the way of initiation, it certainly made itself *particeps criminis* in their disgraceful doings by lack of energy and honesty in dealing with the horrible schemes emanating from the radical element in the legislature. It may, indeed, be said, in the way of justification for their weakness, that had they offered resistance to that element in its fury, their resistance would have brought about their defeat. Granted; but in countries where constitutional government is understood no statesman would keep office on such terms. Even under a purely absolute regime, no minister of honest convictions would consent to sacrifice principle to base and selfish expediency. But in France, as at present governed, ministers and legislatures do what in no other country, however badly governed, could be attempted. War has there been declared on religion day after day, and schemes of legislative vandalism, sacrilegious expropriation and Nero-like ferociousness introduced into the Chambers and hurried through their various stages amid rapturous applause. Had M. de Freycinet and his colleagues proved true to their better feelings and convictions, by fearlessly resisting schemes such as those relating to education, divorce, church property and the liberty of religious orders long enjoyed under the plighted faith of France, they might indeed have been driven from their offices, but they would have succeeded in rallying around them the very best elements of French society whose strength now latent could only be aroused by such a course. They have now lost office by attempting to dally with those aggressive elements of radical destructiveness that have of late made themselves felt in French affairs. A ministry with a firm and settled domestic policy never lacks support when defining and proposing an honest scheme of foreign policy. M. de Freycinet was weak and vacillatory in his domestic policy. He had, properly speaking, no party at his back, and, therefore, completely failed of his purpose when the Egyptian crisis made it necessary for him to adopt a scheme of conjoint intervention with England for the protection of the Suez canal. His defeat was one of the most ignominious ever experienced by a Minister. For him there voted 75 and against him 450 deputies. Besides the defeat of the minister this vote has special significance as being a protest against conjoint intervention with England for the protection of the canal. It is no secret that from the beginning of the crisis the French people have not looked with favor on the action of England in assuming the sole responsibility for the protection of European interests in Egypt and for having undertaken the bombardment of Alexandria. The strength of popular opinion on this subject is fully reflected by the vote in the Chamber of Deputies whereon M. de Freycinet fell. His fall is another indication of the lack

of real statesmanship in French legislative circles and the instability of republican institutions in France.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway west of Winnipeg is proceeding with extraordinary rapidity. It is now estimated that before next spring 663 miles of track will have been laid west of the Manitoban metropolis. There are now employed on the prairie section of the road seven thousand six hundred men. The firm of Langdon, Shepherd & Co., who have a contract for 500 miles of the line, have 4,200 men and 1600 teams now at work. The track laying proceeds at the rate of three miles a day, but this rate will soon be increased to four miles. Nothing ever accomplished on the continent in the way of track-laying exceeds this record. The working force will be gradually increased, and operations carried on throughout the winter. Mr. Shepherd, a member of the contracting firm above mentioned, hopes to do even better. He expects to have the road carried fully fifty miles beyond the crossing of the Saskatchewan river. We hope his expectations may be realized, but feel perfectly satisfied with the present rate of progress, which will, in less than another year, bring the road to the Rocky Mountains.

A sensational despatch purporting to convey reliable news of the apprehension of one of the murderers of Lord Cavendish, made its appearance in the daily press, some days ago. The supposed criminal, one Westgate, was taken in the republic of Venezuela, whither he had gone, according to his own statement, immediately after the assassination. It now turns out, however, that he had actually left Dublin before the commission of the crime. Very little reliance is placed on his statements. The police are reported to be working on better clues in the Irish metropolis itself. Every lover of order would rejoice to see the real perpetrators of the awful crime taken into custody and severely punished, but care should be taken not to give publicity to statements of confessions of worthless characters eager for cheap notoriety or paid to malign the character of respected public men. If this man, Westgate, turns out to be an impostor, as we believe he will, he should be punished very severely.

From Utah comes the news that the Mormons are determined to offer vigorous resistance to the Edmunds law, specially designed against polygamy. They have been, of late, receiving large numbers of European adherents and feel confident of being able to overcome the provisions of this law. An attempt will be first made to test the constitutionality of the act before the Supreme Court of the United States. But if the decision of the Court should prove adverse to the views of the Mormons they are determined to resist at any cost. The difficulty will thus be brought to a head and upon the Federal government will then rest the responsibility of obliterating by every means, even force, if necessary, a system disgraceful to civilization and incompatible with Christian teachings. It is to be regretted that the Edmunds Act does not prohibit the settling in Utah of Mormon recruits obtained through the efforts of paid agents from certain countries in Europe. So long as persons of this class are freely permitted to find homes in the United States and pursue their infamous practices, the difficulty of suppressing the evil will daily grow.

Archbishop Taschereau, of Quebec, has very properly condemned *Le Courrier des Etats Unis*, a French liberal paper published in New York. This paper, which is well known for its anti-Christian tendency and tone, has quite a circulation in Montreal and Quebec. The Archbishop forbids the reading of the paper as well as the patronizing or encouraging of it in any way by any of his flock. His Grace finds special fault, we believe, with the romances published in the columns of the *Courrier*, holding them to be

in many cases of a very immoral nature. The prohibition of the *Courrier* should cause no regret even to its readers in Quebec, who have a wide field in the way of newspaper literature still at their command. There never was a time when Catholics should be more careful than now to refuse encouragement to journals professing principles hostile to christian order or giving space to productions inculcating lessons contrary to christian morality.

The *American* states that there are now before Congress two bills relating to Alaska which it hopes will become law at the earliest moment. One provides for a simple form of territorial government; the other appropriates a certain sum to be applied to educational purposes within this vast region. Alaska, as our contemporary justly maintains, is a valuable possession, having paid, since its acquisition, fully four per cent. a year on its purchase money. It has given America cod fisheries richer than those of Newfoundland, and salmon fisheries surpassing those of the Columbia River. The American government has done little or nothing for Alaska since its cession. The *American* contrasts the conduct of America with that of Russia in regard to Alaska:

"The Russians taught the sixteen thousand people of the Aleutian Islands to read and write, and initiated them into the rudiments of civilization and Christianity. Both their schools and their churches have been allowed to lapse; the younger generations are growing up in ignorance; the cruelties and abominations of heathenism, including witch-roasting, are making inroads among them; and there is danger of their utter relapse into barbarism. The Russians kept out whiskey and small-pox; under American rule both have free course. The Russians gave them an effective police and courts of justice; Americans have left them to Judge Lynch. In fine, the country is distinctly the worse for its separation from Russia and annexation to the United States."

In view of this unsatisfactory state of affairs it is to be sincerely hoped that Congress will give speedy assent to the measures spoken of, and that the passage of these measures may prove but the beginning of a new era of American rule in Alaska.

The so-called national liberal party of Westphalia, Hesse-Nassau, and Rhenish Prussia lately held a Congress at Cologne. There was a very large attendance. In the course of his speech Bennigsen, the Parliamentary leader of the party, laid down the programme of the party for the coming elections to the Prussian Landtag. He spoke strongly in favor of a union of all the various elements of liberalism against the Catholic and conservative majority. The liberal party, as is well known, is divided into various groups without the strength of cohesion. Without union and consolidation into one body these factions can never accomplish much against their common adversary. But while such a union were very desirable from a liberal standpoint, it will be found very difficult to carry out, as there is very great diversity of opinion between the different sections of German liberalism. They are united, however, on one point, that of hostility to the Church, Herr Bennigsen himself declaring strongly in favor of state intervention and state predominance in matters ecclesiastical. We hope to see the Catholic body present a solid front at the October elections against every form of liberalism.

Hon. Mr. Mousseau, sec'y of state, retires from the Dominion Cabinet to make way for Hon. J. A. Chapleau, who resigns the Premiership of Quebec. Mr. Mousseau has accepted the latter position. Mr. Chapleau is a well known politician of the Province of Quebec. He entered its legislature in 1867, and has sat in every Provincial Parliament since that time. He first took office in Feb. 1873, as solicitor general in the Ouimet government. When that government retired in Sept., 1874, Mr. Chapleau became a private member of the Legislature and remained so till January, 1876, when he became Provincial Secretary under Mr. De Boucherville. This office he held till the dismissal of the administration in March in 1878.