

Published every Friday morning at 422 Richmond Street.

Annual subscription.....\$2.00
Six months.....1.00

ADVERTISING RATES.
Two cents per line for first, and five cents per line for each subsequent insertion. Advertisements measured in nonpareil type, 12 lines to an inch.
Contract advertisements for three, six or twelve months, special terms. All advertisements should be handed in not later than Tuesday morning.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.
All matter intended for publication must have the name of the writer attached, and must reach the office not later than Tuesday noon of each week.

THOR. COFFEY.
Publisher and Proprietor.

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 tone 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, JUNE 11, 1880.

GARIBALDI AND THE HOUSE OF SAVOY.

The House of Savoy became years ago the creature and instrument of the revolutionists of Italy. It lent its name and aid to rebellion in Lombardy, to spoliation and robbery in the Romagna, to treason in the Sicilies. Count Cavour decided on an united Italy, and to accomplish this purpose employed every instrument within reach. He cajoled the people, flattered the king, and coquetted with the secret societies. These organizations were then and are today the sworn foes of religion, society, and royalty. Their machinations plunged Italy, and especially Rome, into confusion and bloodshed in the year 1848. Their purpose was then the destruction of the regal form of government and the establishment of socialist or communist sway. Yet these men, avowing principles so detestable and so destructive, were the chosen and trusted allies of Count Cavour, the Piedmontese minister, in his task of consolidating Italy. Garibaldi, their leader, was made the hero of the movement. To him was entrusted the task of inciting the populations of Northern Italy against Austria in 1859. To him was given the post of sacrilegious aggression in the attempts on the Papal States, to him was allotted the duty of inciting to treason the soldiers and people of the Kingdom of Naples. All this was done at the instigation of the Royal House of Savoy. The unification of Italy apparently progressed under the magic influence of the plebiscite, and the nominal power of that royal house greatly increased. But now, after twenty years' experience, if we ask has Italy really been united, what will our answer be? Kings and princes were indeed dethroned to create an apparent union, but the people of the Italian peninsula are as dissociated from centralization as they were before 1859-60. If we ask has the House of Savoy been benefited by the change, we are forced to admit that in grasping at an empire that royal family has shaken the throne which it honored by its heroic magnanimity. What, then, is the outcome of the Italian revolutions: Industrial stagnation, financial depression, gloom, distress, beggary, brigandage and assassination.

In the midst of the confusion, the offspring of his own hideous doctrines, Garibaldi now raises his voice to denounce the House of Savoy as the author of Italian misery. We are not of those who would palliate crime or treachery even in royalty. But criminal and cowardly as the course of the Sardinian Court has been, it is perhaps, as far as Garibaldi is concerned, as much sinned against as sinning. The late King Victor Emmanuel was the victim and slave of the secret societies. They gave him dominion and exacted obedience. In his abjectness he courted the favor of Garibaldi and rested his claims to popularity on his friendship with this wretched mountebank. He trampled under foot the teachings of a holy mother and despised the traditions of a glorious ancestry—all to conciliate the evil spirit of revolution. His course was one of guilt,

of perfidy, and ingratitude. But what course did the revolutionary party adopt? The King once enmeshed, they hold him in powerlessness. They had used his name to better attain their objects. These objects attained, they commence to undermine the throne they had set up. Before Victor Emmanuel himself had been firmly seated on his throne, they had all things in readiness for murder and assassination. In every corner of the peninsula their presence is now felt. Their enmity to royalty will win them friends from the extreme schools of politics, and King Humbert have to bear that sorrow and humiliation spared his father by a premature death. The dark shadow of Garibaldian treachery and atrocity overhangs the fortunes of the House of Savoy. Its crimes are indeed great, but the punishment in store for these crimes will appal even those who look on the perfidy of the Sardinian Court with greatest aversion, and serve as another warning to kings that the Vicar of Christ cannot be despoiled or outraged with impunity.

IRISH CATHOLIC COLONIZATION.

Our American neighbors deserve commendation for the movement they have set on foot to establish Catholic colonies in the west. The Irish Catholic body in the United States has not progressed as its activity, intelligence, and worth at one time promised, for the simple reason that the Irish people became in too few cases owners of the soil. The bulk of the Irish population remained in the large seaport towns and manufacturing centres of the East. Their progress in these places has indeed been wonderful, but too many of them, led by the abundance of money earned by their hard labor, have fallen into habits of improvidence and plunged their families into poverty and perhaps crime. Large numbers did indeed seek homes in the rural districts, but for want of any concerted action isolated Irish families placed in the midst of intolérant Americans grew, in many cases, neglectful of religion, and in one generation their faith became a wreck. The number of those who thus lost the faith is indeed very great. The Irish emigrations to America from the earliest times were largely composed of Catholics. Yet outside of the cities and towns the Catholic population of the United States has not been on the increase. On the contrary, the Catholic rural population has, if anything, receded. The same fact may be noticed in various parts of Canada. Hence the want of organization in the work of colonization. The Irish Catholic Colonization Society of the United States now supplies the want long since felt in that country. The society is engaged in colonizing with Catholics large tracts of country in the West. Its operations date from a very recent period, yet the work has flourished even beyond the most sanguine anticipations. Large and progressive Catholic settlements have been established in Minnesota and Nebraska. These settlements will be the nuclei of a vast scheme of Catholic colonization. Not only are homes offered to Irish immigrants but to the laboring classes on the eastern seaboard. They are invited to labor for themselves—to give their families a home and a competency. Large numbers are according to the invitation, and the results cannot fail to be of lasting benefit both to Church and State. Could not we in Canada imitate the excellent example set us by our American fellow-countrymen? We have not, indeed, worldly wealth in the abundance in which they enjoy it. But we have means sufficient to enable us, with proper organization, to establish healthy Catholic settlements in our own North-west. We most assuredly have in our mist public spirited citizens ready to take the initiative in such a movement. Our clergy, always ready to forward a good work, will not be behind hand to assist a movement so essentially Catholic. There is nothing then to prevent its success. We once before suggested a convention of delegates from Irish Catholic societies throughout Canada as a comparatively easy, yet comprehensive means of reaching the desired end. That Irishman who is

instrumental in bringing about such a convention will do more for Irish Catholics than could be accomplished by centuries of wailing over grievances begotten very frequently of the disappointment of hungry office-seekers.

A PILGRIMAGE OF SORROW.

The visit of the ex-Empress Eugenie to South Africa to pour the fullness of her maternal grief on the spot which witnessed the death agony of the Prince Imperial, recalls the touching and sorrowful incidents connected with the death of this chivalrous prince. He died as became one of his noble ancestry, but he died fighting in a distant land on behalf of a power who recognized not his services, and whose soldiers abandoned him to savage foes at a trying moment. His generous disposition led him to sacrifice a life, which, had it been spared, might have accomplished great things for France and for humanity.

His noble mother, whose every hope-aye, whose very life, was bound up in this generous youth—now suffers a veritable martyrdom of sorrow. But though bereft of imperial splendor, which, while adding lustre to her dignity, added nothing to her merit, she is to-day in the depth of her maternal grief—more the admiration of the world as a mother than she was even as Empress. But she seeks not admiration. Her life will, after her return from this pilgrimage of devotedness, be a life of oblivion of earth and its vain ambitions, while the world will ever, in the contemplation of her sorrow, pause to reflect on what the son of such a mother might have been.

THE ECUMENICAL.

We are at length enlightened on the proposed Ecumenical Conference of the Methodist body. The Conference is called on the recommendation of a committee which met on the 10th ult. in Cincinnati. This committee, composed of representatives of various Methodist organizations, lays down certain suggestions concerning the proposed conference, some of which invite attention.

The committee begins by stating that the conference is not for legislative purposes, "for it will have no authority to legislate." A more cogent reason to prevent any legislative action on the part of the conference could hardly, we must confess, be found. But after denying the right of the conference to legislate, the committee declares in the very next paragraph of its recommendation that the conference "might properly consider" amongst other things, "the spiritual unity of Methodism, and the best way to secure its maintenance and increase."

Of what use, it may in reason be asked, will the consideration of the conference be unless accompanied with some action to enforce its decisions? But this conference, according to the arrangements of the committee, is destined to fill a large place in the curiosity shop of the sectaries. In the first paragraph of the "recommendation," the conference is, besides being inhibited all legislative action, deprived of all doctrinal power, "for Methodism," declares this sapient committee, "has no doctrinal differences"—quite refreshing, indeed. But if Methodism has no doctrinal differences, whence its divisions? The report of the very committee whose statements we are discussing is signed by representatives of eleven different religious bodies. If there be no doctrinal differences between these bodies, why this division into so many jarring sects?

The conference, having no legislative power and no doctrinal differences to adjust, according to the statement of the committee, will have very little to do. But stay—the committee furnishes the following choice tit-bit: "A Methodist Ecumenical Conference might properly consider such topics as these: The duty of Methodism in respect to Popery, paganism, pauperism, etc., etc." We regret that the alliteration stops so suddenly, and in our earnest desire to see the conference occupied with some useful work, will continue it by suggesting other important topics, such as pig-sticking, pie-making and potato bugs. Then

these latter topics, if duly considered by the conference, may bring about some wholesome discussion. The first will be found of interest to the rural delegates—even more so than Popery. The second will, we are convinced, occupy a much larger share of the attention of the female representatives than paganism itself, while the third will attract universal attention. With topics such as these the conference may spend its time profitably. Not having any doctrinal or legislative authority, it might indeed feel itself at a loss for useful work. But by enlarging its sphere to take in the important matters just named, it will have no time to lose, and may make itself useful to the world at large.

RECEPTION INTO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH OF AN ANGLICAN MINISTER.

On Tuesday, June 1st, a modest but impressive ceremony took place in St. Alphonsus Chapel, Windsor. It was witnessed by a few select friends, but the angels in heaven doubtless looked upon it with rejoicing and complacency. The talented pastor of the Walkerville English Church, the Rev. J. R. Jones, was on this day, together with his excellent family, wife and children, admitted into the bosom of the Catholic Church. After a long time of careful study and fervent prayer, the rev. gentleman yielded to the irresistible conviction which forced itself upon him—that there is but one true church, out of which salvation cannot be attained. The struggle between faith and heresy, between the grace of God and the powers of darkness, had been a long and painful one. Divine assistance triumphed at last, and Rev. Mr. Jones, formerly the respected pastor of an Anglican Church, came before the altar of God with a generous and unhesitating heart to abjure the error, of Protestantism, and offer himself an humble and devoted son to the ancient church, whose claims he accepted with a sincere heart and an unfeigned faith.

The solemn and imposing ceremony of conditional baptism was administered by Right Rev. Monsignor Bruyere, V. G., who replaced His Lordship Bishop Walsh, who was unavoidably prevented from conferring the sacred rite. The Very Rev. Dean Wagner, the pastor of Windsor, attended, acting as sponsor to the new converts. Mrs. Davis, a distant relative of Mrs. Jones, accepted the office of godmother. Previous to administering the sacred rite of Baptism to the neophytes, Monsignor Bruyere addressed them in a few words on the invaluable blessings of which they were about to become the recipients, and dwelt in a special manner on the inestimable advantages they would derive from their connection with the church, the true Spouse of Christ, in which alone they would find peace of mind, and rest of heart, after their long wandering through the trackless wilds of Protestantism. He concurred his remarks by explaining to them the important obligations they would contract in baptism, and the necessity they would be under of ever living up to the precepts and maxims of Jesus Christ, and not in accordance with the corrupt and corrupting practices of the world.

The address being ended, Mr. Jones, his good lady and two boys, received on their heads the regenerating waters of baptism, thus becoming children of God, members of the Holy, Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church, and regenerated in Jesus Christ. Mr. Jones is no longer the blind believer of a new-fangled creed; he is no longer a preacher in what he has, happily for himself, discovered to be a bogus church. But he is what he values a great deal more—he is a humble and happy son of the church which is the pillar and ground-work of truth, the church against which the gates of hell shall never prevail, because it alone is grounded on the promises of Christ. Misgivings and doubts have been dispelled by the light of truth. He is no longer tossed to and fro by every wind of doctrine. He is secure on the rock of Peter. Peace and rest have succeeded terrible anxieties of mind and violent struggles.

Mr. Jones, after many days of fervent prayer and patient investigation, has made a solemn profession of Catholic faith. He has taken this important step having before his eyes the heavy sacrifices it imposed upon him, and on all dear to him. He has resigned his office which was his only means of support. But in doing so he has satisfied his conscience and fulfilled a sacred duty. He was actuated during his long and painful struggle by one ruling motive and desire, to save his immortal soul by obeying the dictates of his conscience. Now, in view of the heavy sacrifices incurred by Mr. Jones in consequence of his change of religion, and of the pure motives which have influenced him throughout his long and painful trial, one would think that this gentleman is entitled to some sympathy and respect. We should expect that those whose religious convictions differ from his would respect his honest course, and at least remain silent, even if they cannot approve

what he has done in compliance with the strict injunctions of his conscience.

But alas! this is not the case. We are informed, on what we consider good authority, that the conversion of Mr. Jones to the Catholic Church has raised against him a most violent storm of abuse and censure. His motives are impugned, even the soundness of his judgment is questioned. We would not be surprised if the ignorant bigots among the opponents of the Church should put Mr. Jones down as an insane man, a demented fanatic. The illustrious Dr. Ives, formerly Anglican Bishop of North Carolina, was similarly treated when, in the free exercise of his judgment, he chose to become a Catholic. All the old women of both sexes in the United States, on that melancholy occasion, turned up to heaven the whites of their eyes, and groaned in their hearts. We hope Mr. Jones will not permit the peace of mind which he now enjoys to be disturbed by senseless clamors and frantic explosions of fanaticism. The storm will pass away, and a serene heaven above will smile upon him.

Mr. Jones may well afford to pity his ignorant and fanatic detractors, who find fault with him, pour ridicule upon his conduct, and point him out with the finger of contempt. This gentleman has done what hundreds and thousands of ministers of different denominations have done for the last twenty-five years, in England, Ireland, Scotland, in fact, all over Europe. He has followed the example set before him by countless numbers of the noblest sons and daughters of England, by the most pious and learned believers in Protestantism in the two hemispheres. Many among the converts to our church had nothing to gain in a temporal point of view, but rather a great deal to lose by changing their religion. In many instances they lost their all, worldly prospects, fortune, high positions, all the comforts of life. They were not applied by numerous and heavy sacrifices. Their salvation was at stake. This it is that supported them in all their trials and sacrifices. They could not save their souls out of the church. Therefore, they did not hesitate a moment to impose on themselves the heaviest sacrifices, in order to purchase the priceless pearl of the true faith. Counting all things but as nothing, that they may gain Christ.

THE GLADSTONE GOVERNMENT.

The Gladstone Cabinet is already suffering from the irresolution of its leaders. It was placed in power to effect important reforms. These reforms were eagerly demanded by the people, and required vigor and determination on the part of the people's leaders. A measure of land law reform—a measure for the extension of the franchise, and others of less importance, are the requirements, nay, necessities of the times. The ministerial programme already published does indeed promise a certain extension of franchise to Ireland, but nothing in the shape of land law reform. Yet ministers cannot be ignorant of the truth that so long as the Irish land laws remain in their present condition Ireland will suffer from periodically recurring famines. The landlord influence in the Gladstone Cabinet is evidently too great. The Premier himself must know his duty, and if he fail through irresolution to fulfill it in the important matter to save a whole nation from famine, he cannot expect to receive, and will not receive, Irish support.

His action in regard of the recall of Sir Bartle Frere from South Africa has already alienated the sympathies of a large body of Liberals from the government. They feel that aristocratic influence begins even this early in the career of a Liberal administration to defy the popular voice. What must not the representatives of Ireland feel when, instead of a comprehensive measure of land law reform, the Irish Secretary proposes a paltry measure of relief. Their just indignation must indeed be great. We gave the new Premier the credit he merited for appointing, according to their desires, Lords Ripon and Kenmare to important offices. But the appointment of Catholic noblemen to high places will not relieve Catholic Ireland of a crying grievance. Irish soil must be given to Irish owners before Ireland will be happy or the Empire at peace.

THE CABLE informs us that Protestant anger against the appointment of Lord Ripon as viceroy of India shows no signs of subsiding. It will, we feel certain, subside ere long. It has touched high water mark now, and will recede rapidly. We feel justified in characterizing this as a sample of bigotry and intolerance which is not creditable to the few small-souled people who have given it birth.

INGERSOLL.

A Jesuit Priest Replies to his Eulogy of Tom Paine.

A few Sundays ago, in the Church of St. Francis Xavier, St. Louis, Mo., the Rev. Thomas Hughes, S. J., addressed a large congregation in reply to Mr. Robert G. Ingersoll's lecture on Tom Paine, recently delivered in Chicago. He said:

MY DEAR FRIENDS—I had intended to say nothing more upon this subject, and never again to have the occasion of mentioning either the name of the Chicago lecturer, or the name of the Chicago audience. It is the Christian instinct not to mention lightly either what is very holy or what is very wicked; neither to take the name of God in vain nor to mention the name of the evil one. But of course for very different reasons—the one out of respect for God, the other for self-respect. And therefore, last Sunday evening, I never once mentioned the name which, for clearness sake, and, in spite of my repugnance, I shall have to pronounce this evening.

With this apology for seeming to intrude upon the respect which is due to this sacred presence and to ourselves, I venture to state that our subject this evening will be the

with other side questions, as they arise in his discourse, delivered about two weeks ago on Thomas Paine. To this subject I have been led by the desires of those who were present here last Sunday, and who expected, in addition to what I then said, a direct refutation of the Chicago lecture. And, in the first place, let us locate all parties concerned, and know who's who and what's what.

If libel is a malicious defamation of character, and is a crime, and as you will understand that to libel the Founder of the common Christian religion professed by all Christian nations is a criminal cause of a deep dye, and puts the criminal on his defense under a dark cloud, indeed of criminality. This libeling is a veritable blasphemy. And by the common law of Christian nations, unmodified in this State of Missouri—and it is only fair to presume as much of other States in the Union—the blasphemous is a criminal, punishable by law with "fine and imprisonment."

Do you want to know, therefore, the "who's who" and the "what's what" of the present case? I answer that Ingersoll is a blasphemer, who, by the common law of this Union, is punishable with fine and imprisonment. And the indictment against him is that of libeling or maliciously defaming the Founder of our common Christianity, and the God of nations and of armies, who, in His wisdom and sublime regard for the liberties and common sense of men, has left them to vindicate His honor and the purity of His religion in their midst. And I mentioned to you, last Sunday evening, that when Erskine prosecuted Williams for the mere publication of Tom Paine, the jury, notwithstanding the ability and talent evident in defense of Williams, returned a verdict of "guilty" without leaving their seats.

Were it not by reason of my position, which calls upon me to correct, to admonish and refute, I should be bound, as every one else is bound, by the law of nature and the law of God to abstain from all reading of the kind supplied by the Chicago lecture. That prohibitory law is based on the principle that he who touches pitch shall be defiled thereby. To come to the lecture.

The speaker is paid for the occasion, and he plays according to his pay. I think, besides, that his heart is somewhat in the subject; so he plays doubly well. His characteristic excellence is audacity. And to illustrate the said feature, allow me to remind you of what Bacon says about it. He says that once upon a time Demosthenes was asked what was the first thing in eloquence? And he answered: Action or delivery. What was the second? Action, delivery. And the third? Action, delivery. Strange! philosophizes Bacon. Strange that the part of an orator, which is but superficial, and rather the virtue of a stage player, should be rated so high above all the other noble parts, as if it stood alone, nay, as if it were all in all. But the reason, he says, is plain. It is because there is in human nature generally more of the fool than of the wise, and therefore, those faculties by which the foolish part of men's minds are taken are most potent. And so, he goes on to say, audacity, audacity, audacity, child of ignorance and child of baseness, doth fascinate, and blind both hand and foot of those who are either shallow in judgment or weak in courage, and they are always the majority. Thus far Bacon.

And on the face of it there is, my friends, in the lecture before us, a boldness, an audacity on the surface generally without bounds, and a shallowness which is marvelous for the extent it reveals of sand and mud and stones. Nay, I am bold myself in undertaking to speak of the logic of Ingersoll, when, as you will see, there is no logic to speak of; when, if there were rhyme at least, it would be something, but at present he is destitute of rhyme and reason alike. Utter destitution! Like the "fripper's or broker's shop" that Bacon alludes to, which has ends of everything and nothing of worth.

INGERSOLL'S POINTS, CONSIDERED SERIATIM.

The subject matter in which logic might be found is, in the first place, the argument about Paine's drunken habits; secondly, the clap-trap about liberty and patriotism; and thirdly, the rail against the Bible and religion.

He denies that Paine was a drunkard; he proves that he was not. How does he prove it? He asks a string of questions: Do Christians really think that Paine was a drunken beast when he wrote "Common Sense"? Was he a drunkard when he wrote the "Crisis"? Was he a drunken beast when he received £500 from the Legislature of Pennsylvania, and so forth and so forth. Here the lecturer implies that Paine could not be a drunkard if he received £500 from a Legislature (mark this! What do politicians say?); if he was elected member of the French Convention, which was itself drunk with blood. Therefore, who, in this enlightened age, can presume to think that Paine judged drunk of milk-punch? This is the lecturer's argument.

I answer by reversing the argument. And I say: Could Paine write if he were not a drunkard? Could cert in historical