



ARCHBISHOP CROKE.

The Great Prelate Scorches the Orange "Catholics."

A Stinging Letter on the Results of the Last Elections.

His Grace Archbishop Croke of Cashel has addressed the following letter to the Irish Press:

My Dear Sir,—Now that the contests for the four divisions of the county of Tipperary are well over, and that the popular irritation to which they naturally gave rise has begun to abate, I seek your leave to offer through your columns a short running commentary on this striking, and, in some respects, somewhat unusual episode in our local history, to sound a salutary note of warning in connection with it, and to point a moral as well.

The green polling power in this country is a second number about 26,000. Of that number over 17,000 came up to record their votes. The four Tory candidates polled 821. Consequently the aggregate popular vote amounted to 16,000 and more. That is to say, the popular candidates polled each in the proportion of twenty to one as against the so-called Constitutionalist candidates. But, owing to the fact that the Nationalists throughout the country regarded the contests put upon them as mere shams, about 9,000 of their party did not appear at the polling booths at all. They would have been there to the last man, however, had they thought, or been told, that it was necessary for them to do so.

Such being, in plain English, the facts and figures of the case, it must occur to every one to ask what on earth was this purpose in a teapot? Why did the Tory landlords mean by provoking contests in Tipperary?—and who could have had them play so silly a game? They had no idea whatever of scoring a victory. They were, on the contrary, certain of defeat. They met with an ignominious one in reality. It is not often that people go in for utter discomfiture and the many humiliations that usually attend it; and when they do, they are justly reputed to be either lunatics, or deeply designing and selfish knaves.

So what did the Tories mean by fighting for the four seats in Tipperary; or, in other words, what did they mean by putting 16,000 adult Tipperary men into accelerated and undesirable motion during this dreadful December weather, and thus causing them publicly to declare that they looked upon all the Whigs and Tories in their midst as their deadliest enemies, and the followers of Mr. Parnell as their staunchest friends? Surely it was not for mere amusement, that all this was planned and executed, as frolicsome youths are wont, from sheer exuberance of animal spirits, to fling their caps into the air, and kick them exultantly when they come down. Not at all; for, as a rule, the folk of whom there is now question, the prime movers in our late quadrilateral tournament—the Cardinals, the Franks, the Knoxes and the general ruck of those who have hitherto "ruled the roost" in Tipperary—are not in our days so facetiously disposed, nor are they by any means laboring under such a plethora of the precious metal, as to go in for the costly electioneering eccentricities recently witnessed here, for mere pastime, and as a purely pleasurable pursuit. They must therefore have meant something serious by their late manoeuvres, and the question is what did they mean?

The leading spirits of the fraternity would not of course for worlds hold any manner of parley with, or commit one of even their minor confidantes to, such a political desperado as I am thought to be; but a youthful member of the party ingeniously told me, nevertheless, that his patrons meant three things by their latest tactics in Tipperary warfare. They meant, first, to exhibit their strength; secondly, to annoy the Nationalists; and, thirdly, to deplete, as far as possible, the National chest.

It must be a source of infinite satisfaction to them to know and feel, and to be told thus publicly by me, that they have succeeded admirably in so far; and that, figuratively speaking, they have hit the bull's eye as regards each of the three objects they so benevolently aimed at. In the first place, they have exhibited their strength. In a population of 190,000 souls their strength consists in this, that barely 821 of them are now known to be in active existence from Parsonstown to Knockmeadown, and from the Shannon at Ballina to the Suir at Carrick.

Secondly, they have mercilessly worried, annoyed, and I would even say unparadoxically exasperated, the long-enduring Nationalists of Tipperary, many of the poorer of whom had to walk miles, amidst pouring rain and pelting storm, to record their votes against their oppressors. But let them take care lest it may come to pass, and far sooner than they imagine, that the now triumphant Nationalists may yet annoy, and remorselessly exact reprisals from them in turn.

Thirdly, they desire to drain, or substantially diminish, the National exchequer, pitilessly piling costs on the people, besides putting them otherwise to serious trouble and inconvenience; but the people may be very easily brought to feel and believe that the process of "cutting short the supplies" is a game that two can play at, and that those who force others to dance should, in all seasons, be made to "pay the piper."

VINDICATING HIS HONOR.

Mr. Boyle, of the "Irish Canadian," answered by Rev. Father Coffey, of the "Catholic Record."

To the Editor of THE POST and TRUE WITNESS:

In your issue of the 21st ult. you did me the honor of entering, on my behalf, a spirited defence against a vile and unfounded attack made upon me in the Irish Canadian, of the 17th of that same month. In that journal, I was, sir, charged with having, at one time, gone out of my way on evil bent, and in language vile and bitter assailed the Irish Land League. Here are Mr. Boyle's own words:

"At one time this consistent gentleman went out of his way on evil bent. With a malice and ferocity that would put to the blush its worst enemies, he launched his invectives against the Irish Land League, and denounced all connected with it—even virtuous and patriotic women—in terms not only bitter but vile. This was in the days when the Land League was in its infancy—when it was weak and struggling; yet that was the time selected by the editor of the Catholic Record to deal it a blow below the belt—to assassinate a movement so full of hope and promise to the Irish people. But the League survived the assaults of its enemies—this gentleman's stab included—till it had accomplished its mission and left behind a successor capable of completing the work which it had begun. It would be dangerous now to attack the Irish Land League; so the editor of the Record fawns where he dare not frown. And yet this is the gentleman who talks of changing front."

Against an attack so wanton and so malicious, in support of which Mr. Patrick Boyle advanced not a iota of proof, you, sir, with a generous regard for a brother journalist unjustly assailed, entered, as I have said, a firm, manly and dignified protest. Your words can bear repetition:

"No comments on the abusive and vituperative language contained in the above extract are necessary, but as to the nature of the charge brought against Father Coffey, that he had denounced the Irish Land League in its infancy and all connected with it, we must say, in the interest of truth and fair play, that the Irish Canadian has sinned most grievously against the reverend gentleman, and has done him a cruel wrong and injustice. Rev. Father Coffey has always been a warm, eloquent and patriotic friend of the Irish cause and of all national movements inaugurated to serve the interests of the Irish people, both at home and abroad. He has never condemned the Land League, as asserted by the Irish Canadian, and a base falsehood could not be invented by the enemy to cover its retreat. Father Coffey's views on the Irish question have ever been of the outspoken national character. Neither in speech or in writing has he ever failed to give his views in very clear expression. The Government must be hard pressed when, failing to refute the arguments of the Record, it is obliged to force its organ to heap personal abuse and slander upon those who have the courage of their convictions, and whose sense of duty is not blunted by political bias or by expectation of favors."

In the very first issue of the Catholic Record after the publication of Mr. Boyle's slanderous assault on my Irish manhood and patriotism, I quote:—"The statement made in the Irish Canadian of last week that the editor of this journal ever condemned or opposed the Land League, is a fabrication of the most vile, deliberate and malicious character. We are not indeed of those whose patriotism is of a mouthing and windy character and a marketable commodity, but have ever given Mr. Parnell from the first assumed the lead in speech or in writing till this moment a loyal and unwavering support. Nay, more, we feel that we have not in the movement of active assistance to the Irish Nationalist Party lately inaugurated proved a stumbling block to its success. We have not put ourselves forward as a leader and then been forced by public opinion to step down and out. We have contributed our mite to the fund, invited others to do likewise, and given the movement an unselfish assistance."

How does Mr. P. Boyle meet the emphatic denial of the editor of the Record? By the production of the latter's alleged condemnation of the league? Not at all. Mr. Boyle is too just and honorable a man to be bound by the ordinary rules of right. He answers every denial, sir, by the citation of Cardinal MacCabe's opinion of the Land League, and then in tones of mock triumph asks: Did the editor of the Catholic Record, at any time, refer to the subject touched by His Eminence? and if so, was the reference a justification or the reverse of what His Eminence had said?

Time and again indeed did the editor of the Record refer to the subject dealt with by Cardinal MacCabe in certain of his pastorals. But though differing from His Eminence's views on Irish politics in almost every particular of importance, I never saw fit to assail by name that learned ecclesiastic, who, whatever his peculiarities of view on the Irish national problem, was venerated by all who knew him for his apostolic ardor and boundless charity. His office was too high, his person too sacred, for any shafts from my feeble and unworthy hand. And now, though wishing to leave his ashes in the peace of their Christian grave, I will with your kind permission show your readers how at the "one time" referred to by Mr. Boyle I dealt with the said question in Ireland. In the Record of Oct. 3, 1879, I advocated Mr. Parnell's choice as leader of the Irish National party in Parliament. My exact words were these:—"Now that Mr. Butt has passed away we believe that the sooner Mr. Parnell is invested with the leadership by the Irish representatives the better for Home Rule and the better for Ireland." These words I penned several months before Mr. Parnell was

ISRAEL'S SOMERSAULT.

Mr. Pacaud Unmasks a Traitor.

HOW ISRAEL TARTE TURNED OVER.

QUEBEC, 24th Dec., 1885.

The following trenchant letter has been addressed to the Witness in answer to Mr. Tarte's last juggling letter on the present agitation against Sir John and Orangemen. It is instructive and interesting, showing up in fine style a trickster and traitor:—

SIR.—Mr. Tarte published in Le Canadian, yesterday, a letter that he claims to have addressed to you to rectify certain assertions of your Quebec correspondent taken from L'Electeur, and to better define his position in regard to the National movement.

As both Mr. Tarte and myself have papers at our disposal, it would have been preferable, perhaps, to have discussed our differences at home. Inasmuch, however, as my colleague has seen fit to address your readers not alone to justify himself but to attack and misrepresent the position of the journal which I direct and of those whom it represents, I deem it my duty, with your permission, to follow him upon that ground.

I wish to remark at the outset that my colleague's letter is not absolutely pitched in the same key as the bulk of his published articles after Riel's execution. He seems to have adopted for the English public a very different tone from that in which he generally indulges for the benefit of his French Canadian readers. For my part, though represented as a demagogue and a Radical by Mr. Tarte and his friends, I have no hesitation whatever to maintain, in addressing your readers, the same out-spoken style to which the friends of L'Electeur are accustomed.

Mr. Tarte informs you that, from the start, he has differed with L'Electeur, that he condemned Riel's conduct, declared him guilty of high treason, and refused to regard him as a hero or to blame the French Canadian Ministers for clinging to their portfolio.

A little further on, my colleague adds: "I did not, moreover, abandon the National party for the excellent reason that I never belonged to it."

Mr. Tarte's whole letter is aimed at the justification of this attitude and the denunciation of the "demagogic" proceedings of L'Electeur. The language on his part has produced the most painful surprise in Quebec. In fact, the prominent and active part taken by Mr. Tarte in the present agitation at its start has been so notorious that I utterly fail to understand how it can be profitably denied.

THE GREAT PRELATE SCORCHES THE ORANGE "CATHOLICS."

A Stinging Letter on the Results of the Last Elections.

His Grace Archbishop Croke of Cashel has addressed the following letter to the Irish Press:

My Dear Sir,—Now that the contests for the four divisions of the county of Tipperary are well over, and that the popular irritation to which they naturally gave rise has begun to abate, I seek your leave to offer through your columns a short running commentary on this striking, and, in some respects, somewhat unusual episode in our local history, to sound a salutary note of warning in connection with it, and to point a moral as well.

The green polling power in this country is a second number about 26,000. Of that number over 17,000 came up to record their votes. The four Tory candidates polled 821. Consequently the aggregate popular vote amounted to 16,000 and more. That is to say, the popular candidates polled each in the proportion of twenty to one as against the so-called Constitutionalist candidates. But, owing to the fact that the Nationalists throughout the country regarded the contests put upon them as mere shams, about 9,000 of their party did not appear at the polling booths at all. They would have been there to the last man, however, had they thought, or been told, that it was necessary for them to do so.

Such being, in plain English, the facts and figures of the case, it must occur to every one to ask what on earth was this purpose in a teapot? Why did the Tory landlords mean by provoking contests in Tipperary?—and who could have had them play so silly a game? They had no idea whatever of scoring a victory. They were, on the contrary, certain of defeat. They met with an ignominious one in reality. It is not often that people go in for utter discomfiture and the many humiliations that usually attend it; and when they do, they are justly reputed to be either lunatics, or deeply designing and selfish knaves.

So what did the Tories mean by fighting for the four seats in Tipperary; or, in other words, what did they mean by putting 16,000 adult Tipperary men into accelerated and undesirable motion during this dreadful December weather, and thus causing them publicly to declare that they looked upon all the Whigs and Tories in their midst as their deadliest enemies, and the followers of Mr. Parnell as their staunchest friends? Surely it was not for mere amusement, that all this was planned and executed, as frolicsome youths are wont, from sheer exuberance of animal spirits, to fling their caps into the air, and kick them exultantly when they come down. Not at all; for, as a rule, the folk of whom there is now question, the prime movers in our late quadrilateral tournament—the Cardinals, the Franks, the Knoxes and the general ruck of those who have hitherto "ruled the roost" in Tipperary—are not in our days so facetiously disposed, nor are they by any means laboring under such a plethora of the precious metal, as to go in for the costly electioneering eccentricities recently witnessed here, for mere pastime, and as a purely pleasurable pursuit. They must therefore have meant something serious by their late manoeuvres, and the question is what did they mean?

The leading spirits of the fraternity would not of course for worlds hold any manner of parley with, or commit one of even their minor confidantes to, such a political desperado as I am thought to be; but a youthful member of the party ingeniously told me, nevertheless, that his patrons meant three things by their latest tactics in Tipperary warfare. They meant, first, to exhibit their strength; secondly, to annoy the Nationalists; and, thirdly, to deplete, as far as possible, the National chest.

It must be a source of infinite satisfaction to them to know and feel, and to be told thus publicly by me, that they have succeeded admirably in so far; and that, figuratively speaking, they have hit the bull's eye as regards each of the three objects they so benevolently aimed at. In the first place, they have exhibited their strength. In a population of 190,000 souls their strength consists in this, that barely 821 of them are now known to be in active existence from Parsonstown to Knockmeadown, and from the Shannon at Ballina to the Suir at Carrick.

Secondly, they have mercilessly worried, annoyed, and I would even say unparadoxically exasperated, the long-enduring Nationalists of Tipperary, many of the poorer of whom had to walk miles, amidst pouring rain and pelting storm, to record their votes against their oppressors. But let them take care lest it may come to pass, and far sooner than they imagine, that the now triumphant Nationalists may yet annoy, and remorselessly exact reprisals from them in turn.

Thirdly, they desire to drain, or substantially diminish, the National exchequer, pitilessly piling costs on the people, besides putting them otherwise to serious trouble and inconvenience; but the people may be very easily brought to feel and believe that the process of "cutting short the supplies" is a game that two can play at, and that those who force others to dance should, in all seasons, be made to "pay the piper."

ISRAEL'S SOMERSAULT.

Mr. Pacaud Unmasks a Traitor.

HOW ISRAEL TARTE TURNED OVER.

QUEBEC, 24th Dec., 1885.

The following trenchant letter has been addressed to the Witness in answer to Mr. Tarte's last juggling letter on the present agitation against Sir John and Orangemen. It is instructive and interesting, showing up in fine style a trickster and traitor:—

SIR.—Mr. Tarte published in Le Canadian, yesterday, a letter that he claims to have addressed to you to rectify certain assertions of your Quebec correspondent taken from L'Electeur, and to better define his position in regard to the National movement.

As both Mr. Tarte and myself have papers at our disposal, it would have been preferable, perhaps, to have discussed our differences at home. Inasmuch, however, as my colleague has seen fit to address your readers not alone to justify himself but to attack and misrepresent the position of the journal which I direct and of those whom it represents, I deem it my duty, with your permission, to follow him upon that ground.

I wish to remark at the outset that my colleague's letter is not absolutely pitched in the same key as the bulk of his published articles after Riel's execution. He seems to have adopted for the English public a very different tone from that in which he generally indulges for the benefit of his French Canadian readers. For my part, though represented as a demagogue and a Radical by Mr. Tarte and his friends, I have no hesitation whatever to maintain, in addressing your readers, the same out-spoken style to which the friends of L'Electeur are accustomed.

Mr. Tarte informs you that, from the start, he has differed with L'Electeur, that he condemned Riel's conduct, declared him guilty of high treason, and refused to regard him as a hero or to blame the French Canadian Ministers for clinging to their portfolio.

A little further on, my colleague adds: "I did not, moreover, abandon the National party for the excellent reason that I never belonged to it."

Mr. Tarte's whole letter is aimed at the justification of this attitude and the denunciation of the "demagogic" proceedings of L'Electeur. The language on his part has produced the most painful surprise in Quebec. In fact, the prominent and active part taken by Mr. Tarte in the present agitation at its start has been so notorious that I utterly fail to understand how it can be profitably denied.

putting on the greatest air of conviction or using the greatest energy of expression.

Gradually, however, I admit, my colleague's papers deserted the flag under which we had fought together.

L'Evenement, while in its issue of the 21st, appealed to the population to attend the Quebec Centre meeting en masse, to empty their houses for the purpose, men, women and children, whom it implored to join in the national movement, stated fifteen days afterwards that Messrs. Taschereau, Vallin and Grandbois, M.P.s, were right in preventing the discussion of the Riel question before their electors. Both Le Canadian and L'Evenement had nothing but words of praise for those who stifled the discussion, and but words of sarcasm for the patriotic speakers of both parties, who went into the country to address the people and to get adopted the resolutions prepared by them and by Mr. Tarte himself.

The order of the day thenceforward was to stop the movement, that there had been enough of agitation, that the protests of the cities were sufficient without asking the rural districts to follow their example.

The wise counsels of Mgr. Taohé, warning us against all aggressive and turbulent agitation, were invoked to give an air of authority to the attempt to paralyze a perfectly constitutional movement and the right of free discussion at public meetings.

Then Le Canadian and L'Evenement made another step; they squarely took the defense of the French-Canadian Ministers, which, fifteen days previously, they held responsible for an infamy than which our political history contained nothing more odious.

Here, again, are facts that are too notorious to be seriously disputed. Really, I cannot understand how, under such circumstances, my colleague, Mr. Tarte, can have the face, not only in his own papers, but in other papers, to complain that his attitude in connection with these latter events has been misrepresented.

In his efforts to justify himself, Mr. Tarte seeks to show that it is not he, but L'Electeur, who deviated from the straight line. It seems that L'Electeur has manifested so much demagoguism that it has alarmed not only the other races but the friends of the National movement itself.

My colleague evidently hopes to get this believed by repeating it in all the tones and in all the papers.

But, in the name of heaven, upon what does Mr. Tarte base his right to use such language?

In what has the demagoguism of L'Electeur consisted? Has it, by chance, excited the populace against the authorities or egged on mobs to deeds of violence? Has it vowed to atomize our fellow-countrymen of different origins and creeds from our own?

No, and my readers can attest the fact. I defy anyone to point out a single sentence, a single word, in L'Electeur, to warrant such a reproach.

Al! Mr. Tarte knows well that L'Electeur's only crime is to have continued the work we began together, to have respected the oath we took on the 18th November to avenge the outrage committed upon our whole race; to disabuse those Ministers who, in their calculations upon the fate of Riel, went security that the indignation of the French Canadians would burn out like a fire of straw.

Our colleague has deserted the popular cause to range himself on the side of those guilty Ministers whom our entire population, in their legitimate anger, burst in effigy, and vowed to public execration at all points of the continent.

Mr. Tarte should have at least the decency to spare from his denunciations those who remained faithful to their post, whose sincere convictions he fully knows, and who are prosecuting a work which, we are firmly convinced, he would at bottom rejoice to see triumph.

I have the honor to be, Sir, Your obt. servant, E. PACAUD.

A PRIEST AT SEVENTY-TWO.

The ranks of the priesthood are to receive a venerable recruit in the person of Lord Charles Thynne, youngest son of the second and uncle of the present Marquis of Bath. Lord Charles was born in the year 1813. Educated at Harrow and Christ Church, he entered the service of the Anglican Church, and was Rector of Kingston Deverill, Vicar of Longbridge, and a Canon of Catterbury Cathedral, when, in 1852, he resigned his preferments preparatory to being received into the Catholic Church. Lord Charles married nearly half a century ago Miss Bagot, a daughter of the Bishop of Bath and Wells, but he has been a widower for some years. Lord Charles resided for a long time in Redcliff Gardens, but has lately lived at his place near Woodstock. After he is ordained, the new priest will probably join Canon Brownlow at St. Mary Church, York. Though very unusual, the case of Lord Charles is by no means unique. Persons whose memories carry them back for some forty years will remember that Sir Harry Trelawney, after being received into the Church, was admitted to Orders in Rome when well stricken in years. The question of Anglican Orders had not been so fully sifted then as it has since been, and one of the several remarkable points about the ordination of the Cornish baronet, who had also been a minister of the Church of England, was what Sir Harry sought permission from a Cardinal, who was also a great Canon lawyer, to make mental reservation to the effect that he was receiving orders if he had not received them already. But whether Lord Charles Thynne, at the age of seventy-two, has or has not the distinction of being the most venerable candidate for Orders within living memory, his elevation to the priesthood is an event on which we congratulate him very heartily. It is reported that Lord William Nevill, who some months ago was received into the Catholic Church in Melbourne, and who has returned to England, contemplates entering the priesthood.—London Register.