

**The Catholic Record**  
Published every Friday morning at 42 Richmond Street.  
Annual subscription..... \$2.00  
Six months..... \$1.00

**ADVERTISING RATES.**  
Ten 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 morning of each week.

**THOS. COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.**  
Subscribers who change their residence will please send us, by Postal-card, their old as well as New Address, and thus insure the prompt delivery of the paper.

We are in constant receipt of enquiries from subscribers as to "how much they owe," and requests "to send bill." By consulting the date on your paper both will be answered. The label on your paper shows the time your subscription is paid to.

When a subscriber tells a postmaster to "refuse" on a paper and send it back to the publisher, the line owing more or less for subscription, it may be inferred that the person either knows very little about the way ordinary business is transacted, or is the way in which a publisher can tell who are subscribers and how much they owe. If this name is taken off it will be seen how very awkward it becomes for the proprietor of a newspaper to keep his business in proper shape. Subscribers who desire to stop taking a paper should in all cases remit the amount of their indebtedness when they make request.

**LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSH.**

LONDON, Ont., May 23, 1879.  
DEAR MR. COFFEY.—As you have become proprietor and publisher of the *Catholic Record*, I deem it my duty to announce to the subscribers and patrons that the change of proprietorship will work no change in its policy 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."

FROM HIS GRACE ARCHBISHOP HANNAH.  
St. Mary's, Halifax, Nov. 7, 1881.  
I have had opportunities during the last two years or more of reading copies of the *Catholic Record*, published in London, Ontario, and approved of by His Lordship the Right Rev. Dr. Walsh, the Bishop of that See. I beg to recommend that paper to all the faithful of this diocese.

+ M. J. O'NEIL,  
Archbishop of Halifax.

**Catholic Record.**  
LONDON, FRIDAY, NOV. 25, 1881.

**CONDITIONS OF THE JUBILEE.**

As the exercises of the Jubilee have been announced for Advent, we again publish the conditions as laid down in His Lordship's Pastoral announcing the Jubilee.

- 1st. Confession.
- 2nd. Communion.
- 3rd. One day's strict fast to be observed on some day when otherwise a strict fast is not of obligation. A strict fast excludes not only the use of meat, but also of eggs, butter, cheese, or any milk-food.
- 4th. Alms given for some pious purpose. These alms will be collected during the different exercises of the Jubilee.
- 5th. Visits to be made to Churches. In this city the faithful will visit three times the Cathedral, and three times also St. Mary's Church. Members of religious communities and their pupils who are boarders shall visit six times the convent chapel.
- 6th. Prayers to be said during these visits according to the intentions of His Holiness for the following objects:—  
(a) For the prosperity and exaltation of the Catholic Church and for the Holy See.  
(b) For the extirpation of heresies and the conversion of all who are in error.  
(c) For concord amongst Christian princes, and for peace and union amongst all the faithful. At each visit the beads or the Litany of Loretto may be recited, or the way of the cross performed for the aforesaid intentions.

The indulgence may be applied by way of suffrage to the souls in purgatory.

**CATHOLIC COLONIZATION.**

We know of no work more useful or praiseworthy than that in which certain leading members of the clergy and laity of the United States are engaged, namely, the establishment of Catholic Colonies in various portions of the Union, particularly in the west. The distinguished gentlemen who have placed themselves at the head of this thoroughly Catholic movement recognize the necessity of earnest action on the part of Catholics, if Catholic influence is to be preserved and maintained in America. They could take no more adequate means to keep that influence alive than the formation of Catholic colonies in the sparsely settled states and territories of the west. The advantages of such colonies to Catholics are quite apparent. The great evils from which Catholicity suffers in America may be reduced to three, irreligious education, mixed marriages, and secret societies. In Catholic settlements, the Catholic people have naturally full control of the education of their children, and can provide them with that religious training without which education is a misnomer and a delusion. Of mixed marriages, every Catholic desiring the name knows enough without our here pointing it out as

one of the most fruitful sources of apostasy which afflict the church of God. Any measure taken to prevent or render difficult the contracting of such marriages is a truly noble work. A distinguished Protestant gentleman lately avowed to the writer that in his estimation, based on a lengthy experience, mixed marriages were highly productive of domestic heart-burnings and rancor, injurious from a civil as well as religious point of view. His avowed corresponds with the opinion of all who have given this subject consideration. The formation of Catholic settlements renders mixed marriages so very difficult—or at all events places Catholic youth in such a position as to be free from temptation in this regard, thus making it a most noble and praiseworthy work. Then, as to secret societies, thrown exclusively, or almost so, into Protestant association, a great temptation to join such bodies. This dangerous Catholic colonization would effectually remove.

We, therefore, feel that those who have interested themselves in this noble work deserve the support and gratitude of all Catholics. Take the State of Minnesota as an instance of the good thus effected. This great state cannot be mentioned in connection with Catholic colonization, without recalling the name of Bishop Ireland, a name that will remain imperishably connected with the marvellous progress of Catholicism in the west. If certain portions of Minnesota be to-day almost entirely Catholic—it is due to the far-seeing devotedness of this estimable prelate. If Catholics to-day hold in that state a position of respectability and influence—if the soil of large sections of that—one of the most fertile and favored regions in the globe—be in their possession, Bishop Ireland is entitled to all praise and undying gratitude. He has already won the benefits attending the success of his great scheme of colonization—and the next generation will bear attestation to his self-sacrificing zeal and devotion. There has been, we are glad to learn, a Catholic settlement recently formed in Arkansas. This is one of the States of the Union most admirably adapted to colonization. Other States, such as Texas, Kansas, Nebraska, California, and Oregon, offer splendid advantages to colonists, and will, no doubt, receive their due share of attention from the managers of the Catholic colonization movement. In some of these, Catholic colonies have in fact been already successfully established. If Catholic colonization be attended with such good results as we well know it is, in the United States—it should be likewise in Canada. Upon, at least, one occasion, we suggested the advisability of having a convention of representative Canadian Catholics summoned to discuss and adopt some plan for the settlement by Catholics of a portion of our great western Territories. At the grand reunion of French Canadians held some time ago in Quebec, the subject of colonization was very ably discussed, but no definite action, as far as we know, taken to carry out the views in this regard of the leading French Canadian publicists. What is wanting on the part of Catholics in this country, is the establishment of representative organizations to promote the formation of Catholic settlements as well in the older Provinces as in the North West. We have in Canada many rich and highly favored sections of country, awaiting colonization and development. The Catholics of Canada could not devote themselves to a better purpose than the reclaiming for the thousands of their faith, here as well as elsewhere, dependent on a precarious mode of livelihood, the advantages of happy, peaceful, Catholic homes. We again press this subject on the attention of our readers, and earnestly trust that some decisive action may be taken to further the establishment of Catholic colonies, and thus secure premanency in this Dominion for that religious influence that has already done so much for its advancement and prosperity.

Just let the world see which way you are determined to go and it will set its mighty shoulders to the wheel and help you along, caring little whether your destination be heaven or hell.

**IRISH DISCONTENT.**

It is customary with certain politicians, in sympathy with the British Whig party, to point out with boastful pride all that Parliament has within a generation or two accomplished for Ireland, and thereupon express surprise, not entirely free from anger and disappointment, that the Irish people should still be discontented. Irish discontent is, indeed, one of the problems of the day, and the contention of those who consider it ill-founded and unreasonable invites consideration. To come to a just understanding of the nature and extent of the dissatisfaction felt by Ireland at its connection with Great Britain, we must, at least, briefly examine the causes which lead to that connection. The motive which prompted the English King Henry II. to invade Ireland was one of conquest. He well knew that the Irish nation had never fully recovered from the effects, deleterious in the last degree, of the Danish invasion. The long sojourn in Ireland of the Danish warriors had divided the Irish into various hostile sections, and broken that broad spirit of national patriotism which in former days had given their country as well peace at home, as honor and renown abroad. Religion had also very severely suffered from the Danish incursions—and the lessening of religious influence amongst a people of so generous, sanguine and enthusiastic a temperament never fails to lead to consequences of a truly deplorable character. From the very days of the Norman conquest of Britain till the landing of Strongbow, the English Kings aspired to the possession of Ireland. Henry II., a most astute, cruel and unscrupulous monarch, saw an opportunity to accomplish that which his predecessors had not dared attempt. Every one knows that through the dissensions of the Irish chieftains he succeeded in acquiring a certain ill-defined dominion in Ireland. His success led to the introduction into that country of a race hostile to the indigenous population, and thus paved the way for that marked division of the Irish nation into two classes, which has continued to subsist through various mutations till the very present time. There have been in Ireland from the first English invasion two antagonistic classes of population, the one favoring, the other opposing British dominion and supremacy. True, indeed, the great majority of the Irish people have, at all times, been enthusiastically in favor of national autonomy—but the minority has been sufficiently powerful, through the influence and support of Britain, to thwart the efforts of the great bulk of their countrymen. The favor and encouragement ever extended by government to the pro-British minority, has always exasperated the majority—for the minority, considering itself safe under governmental protection, has frequently adopted towards the rest of the nation a policy of exclusiveness and rancor without a vestige of palliation or excuse. This we consider one of the fundamental causes of Irish discontent. More especially, since the reformation, have the people of Ireland suffered from the effects of internal strife. When King Henry VIII. placed himself at the head of the anti-papal movement in England, he determined to enforce his views as well in Ireland as in England. He found in the former but little support, except from that class of adventurers to be found in every country at all times, but more especially in days of civil strife and commotion. His policy of unyielding hostility to the papacy was closely followed by his daughter Elizabeth and her immediate successors. Upon those of their Irish subjects who gave their energy to the furtherance of the reformation these sovereigns all conferred place and preferment—for those whose conscience forbade communion with heresy there was nothing but exclusion and persecution. As the great majority of the Irish people, at all times, refused to abandon even when subjected to the most cruel persecution, the faith of their fathers—it can be readily understood that between them and the government which proscribed their religion, there was little friendship. The rigor of governmental

subalterns in endeavoring by force to propagate the tenets of the new religious system, led in fact to frequent outbreaks on the part of the Irish people, eager to secure for themselves and their fellow-Catholics of Great Britain full liberty of conscience. Upon three different occasions the efforts of the Irish, on behalf of religious liberty, partook of a national character—and on each of these three occasions they had triumphed but for the treachery of their foes. Who does not know that but for subterfuge and fraud Hugh O'Neil had secured liberty for the Catholics of Ireland? Who can deny that, but for the faithlessness of the Stuart King Charles I., the "Catholic army" had achieved the religious independence of Ireland? Who calls in question the fact that the remnant of the army which supported King James II. in Ireland, forced the Prince of Orange to grant freedom of worship to his Irish Catholic subjects—a concession afterwards shamefully set at naught? History teaches that every time Ireland took the field for religious liberty, she forced the monarchs of England to promise it—but that the promises of these monarchs were practically worthless. Ireland's humiliations are for the greater part to be traced not to defeat on the field of battle, but to broken faith and violated treaties. To this fact—for the Irish are a keenly sensitive people—is due in a very great measure the depth and intensity of Irish discontent. Another cause of that discontent is to be found in the ungracious and ungenerous manner in which all remedial measures intended to remove Irish grievances have been carried through the British Parliament. We may reduce these measures to a few of a leading character—Catholic Emancipation, municipal reform, the church disestablishment, and the land bill. The bill for the removal of the disabilities of Catholics, though promised previous to the legislative union in 1801, did not become law till 1829, and was then wrung from a reluctant ministry only under the fear of revolution. It was besides accompanied by an ungracious withdrawal of the franchise from the forty shilling freeholders, and still prohibited Catholics from holding certain important offices under the Crown. The measure for the abolition of oligarchical influence in Irish municipalities passed only after a very severe struggle, though a measure similar in character had previously passed both houses for England. The history of the church disestablishment agitation is too fresh in the minds of our readers to need special mention here. Every one remembers the hostility of the Upper Chamber to the bill—and that its assent to it was secured only under the strong pressure of public opinion. As to the land act, it need only be said that it has fallen very far short of the just expectations of the Irish people. Now the Irish are a grateful people. They never forget a favor—and would, if the remedial measures just mentioned had been passed with the generosity becoming the representative bodies of a great nation, fail not to remember their concession with undying gratitude. But the manner in which these measures passed into law served rather to aggravate than diminish the discontent. The whole course of Britain in regard of Ireland, whether that course be repressive or conciliatory, seems so very selfish and disingenuous, as well as devoid of humaneness and generosity, that any one, however carelessly observant of Irish history, must perceive that the Irish race has no cause to look upon its connection with England in any other light than the source of all its unhappiness. Ireland is yet, indeed, discontented, and must remain so, till a radical change be inaugurated in British policy towards that much abused portion of the empire.

WHAT has become of the anti-Irish contributor to our respected contemporary the *Free Press*? We hope his other duties will make it impossible to still further place it in a false position before its readers. His contributions have always betrayed the spleen of a superannuated Irish bailiff, and it is a relief to the readers of the *Free Press* that he has exhausted himself.

**A ROYAL MEETING.**

The recent warm reception tendered in Vienna, by the Emperor Francis Joseph, of Austria, to King Humbert, of Italy, brings into public notice the relations to each other of the States which these sovereigns nominally govern. The houses of Hapsburg and Savoy have never been, especially of late years, on very friendly terms. The former has been, within the memory of this generation, frequently victimized to gratify the inordinate ambition of the latter. The House of Savoy, of its own strength, could have effected little against Austria, but by the skillful use of French and Prussian strength, succeeded in wresting all Northern Italy from the dominion of that empire. The Italian dominions of Austria were amongst the most highly prized of the possessions of the House of Hapsburg, and were abandoned only in obedience to due necessity; but Austria, it must be understood, has not entirely lost her influence in Italy. At the time of the Sardinian invasions of her possessions in that country, there was indeed a strong feeling against foreign rule in Italy. But the so-called domestic rule of the House of Savoy has not given the satisfaction that was expected. Taxation is now higher than it ever was under Austrian rule. Security for person and property is not provided for under the home, as it was under the foreign regime, and the people who were duped by demagogues into revolution now see that in grasping at the shadow they lost the substance of good government. We do not pretend to ignore the excesses of many Austrian representatives in Italy, but we hold that under their administration taken as a whole, the country was blessed with more domestic security than it has been at any time since.

**TAX EXEMPTION.**

We have unfortunately in our midst a class of politicians bent on earning cheap popularity by the advocacy of any proposal, however pernicious the consequences it might lead to, provided it be invested with a certain amount of speciousness. This class of men cannot be relied on to support either of the regular political parties. Their only object is to gratify their own petty, sordid and selfish motives. You may know them by their loudness and vulgarity, by their offensiveness and cowardice, by their mendacity and hollowiness, their truckling and venality. Of this race are the anti-tax exemptionists of the Province of Ontario. There is not one man amongst them of genuine good standing in Canadian politics—and the reason is quite obvious. They have, however, managed to attract some attention and succeeded in deluding many people into the belief that by abolishing exemptions, the rate of municipal taxation would be materially reduced. On this latter account we propose to discuss once more the exemption question. It is held by those advocating the taxing of exempted property, that the so-called exemption, as at present tolerated, means the taxation of the many for the benefit of the few. This we positively deny. We go further. We assert and defy contradiction to our argument, that there is in Ontario nothing but a nominal exemption. The property paying no direct taxes in this Province is either governmental, municipal or ecclesiastical. There is in several of our cities, especially in Toronto and Ottawa, a very large portion of real estate in the hands of either the Provincial or Dominion Governments. The buildings in both cities belonging to government are amongst the finest, and constitute their principal embellishment. In other cities and towns the custom houses and post office buildings also contribute largely to their adornment. Who can deny that the various government buildings through-

out the Province are a standing source of wealth to the places in which they are located. The same may be said of our municipal and ecclesiastical edifices. Our schools, colleges, town halls and churches, all add not only to the beauty, but to the richness of the municipalities in which they are situated. Is it not true that our colleges and high schools bring to the towns in which they are placed very many students from a distance who annually expend large sums of money, most of which goes to the traders, merchants and laborers of the localities wherein they reside during their school term? Instead, therefore, of these institutions being a source of loss, as certain wiseacres in our ward politics endeavor to persuade us, they are one of the steadiest and most unfailing sources of revenue to many of our municipalities. Why is it that our towns and cities are ever so eager to secure the erection of government edifices in their midst. Is it not a well-known fact that our civic municipalities strive with each other to induce government to construct certain particular buildings within their limits? These municipalities know full well the value of these buildings to their inhabitants, and are therefore anxious to have them. On the very same principle that exemption from taxes is granted to manufacturing establishments because they add to the wealth and population of the places wherein they are situated, no taxation should be directly imposed upon the property of public institutions, be they governmental, religious or municipal, because they produce the same and more beneficial results.

It is not our purpose to enter into the discussion from the Christian standpoint, of the evil and injustice of taxing church property. Such taxation were a tribute to the wickedness of the few amongst us who call themselves infidels. Churches, apart from their religious value, are not only one of the chief ornaments of our towns and cities, but enhance the value of secular property therein. To tax them were to prohibit the construction of new and the embellishment of old ecclesiastical edifices. None but the narrowest mind could advocate a step so retrogressive. We hope to see good men of all classes of our population unite to stamp out this pernicious agitation, whose success were a certain proof of the existence in our midst of that modern vandalism which in other countries has spent its strength upon the levelling and destruction of the noblest monuments of religion and education.

**MUNICIPAL REFORM.**

The Legislature will soon be called upon to deal with this matter. In the various cities of Ontario, we have Boards of Aldermen whose duty is supposed to be to attend to the affairs of the municipalities and to perform this duty in a manner becoming gentlemen entrusted with such honorable and responsible positions. In theory the present condition of things may be very good, but in practice aldermanic business has of late years been performed in a most reckless and shameful manner. The present condition of affairs is simply this—Election time comes—a number of persons are chosen to transact the business of the city, the majority of whom would not be given a position in any of the houses of our merchants. We have often pitied the few good men elected to the position of aldermen. They are compelled to waste valuable time listening to the squabbles and scolding matches of ill-bred and ill-educated individuals, who would not be permitted to act in like manner in any bar-room of the city. What is to be done in the premises is a question deserving the most serious consideration of our legislators. We hope they will be enabled to strike upon some plan that will rid us of men whose presence in the Council Chambers of our cities serves to attach a smirch to the name of alderman, and is a disgrace to the municipalities whom they were elected to represent.

When one man has a prejudice against another, suspicion is very busy in coining resemblances.

**"Until the Day Break."**

I.  
O woman, say, is our beloved sleeping?  
Where the day darkness and the lights grow pale?  
Throughout the land there is a sound of weeping.  
Behold, the hands of the sad watchers fall.  
O woman, answer, is our mother dying?  
The lips we loved so, are they closed and white?  
Must we behold our hearts' destroying  
Fast bound in shadows of eternal night?  
II.  
O children, her best sons from her are taken,  
Her hands with many chains are vilely bound.  
In the long night of death she lies forsaken,  
Denied, dishonored, dishonored, and dis-crowned.  
O children, let her slumber if you love her—  
Her hands are wounded, and her veil is torn.  
Can tears efface her shame, or kisses cover  
The brand of bondage her pale brows have borne?  
III.  
Her fate lies written low in dust and ashes  
Of fitful fires that rose and sunk and died—  
Would ye reward her love, her hands that wrought  
Flashes,  
In bloodstained letters on the bare hillside?  
O children, see her feet are bruised and bleed.  
The road was all too stony, and she fell;  
She cannot bear the passion of your pleading—  
Behold she sleepeth. Surely she doth well!  
IV.  
Nay, ye sad watchers round our mother wailing,  
Draw back the covering from her still white face!  
Lo! the rose light of the far dawn is making  
A pallid twilight round her resting place.  
Nay, she shall wake, though iron links may fetter  
And deepen the dark scars with sharper pain.  
Through doubt and anguish, we, her sons,  
Shall set her  
Enthroned and crowned in our fair land again.  
V.  
Yet, O our mother, when in far off ages,  
The younger children stand disconsolled,  
Remember then who toiled for bitter wages—  
Remember the worn hands that wrought for thee.  
Tell them, O mother, how thy dead sons sought thee  
In the long bondage of the bygone years:  
Tell them, if mother, how thy dead sons brought thee  
The only offering that was left them—tears.  
October, 1881.

**LONDON POST OFFICE.**

Complaints have frequently been made that the affairs of the London Post Office were not in a satisfactory condition. We are personally acquainted with all the gentlemen employed in this department of the civil service, in this city, and we hesitate not to say that a more respectable and reliable class of men are not to be found in London. The Postmaster, Mr. Dawson, and his deputy, Mr. Sharman, are gentlemen in whom the public have implicit confidence. They perform their duties in the most satisfactory manner, and are at all times gentlemanly and obliging. The difficulty lies in the fact that there is not sufficient men to perform the work of the office. About five months ago an old and very efficient member of the staff, Mr. John McLaughlin, registered letter clerk, died. At the same time a number of the old hands were superannuated, and little or no provision made to fill the vacancies. The staff, one after the other, became incapacitated, from over work, and hence the unsatisfactory condition of the office. Efforts have been made both in London and in Ottawa to have the office placed in good working order, but it seems very much like as though some subordinate between the two cities was continually throwing obstructions in the way for purposes of his own. The simple fact of the case is this: there is not enough hands, and more must be appointed. The statement made by a contemporary that intemperance was one cause of the trouble, is entirely uncalled for. The man who penned the statement cannot be personally acquainted with the staff. Some of the men who are on the sick list have not tasted drink for years, and none have absented themselves from duty through intemperance.

**THE NEW FRENCH MINISTRY.**

Contrary to the expectations of many, Gambetta has assumed the responsibilities of office. The names of his ministers have been announced only to be received with very emphatic disapproval in France, and open contempt everywhere. The new administration contains no man of prominence, if we except Gambetta himself and Mr. Paul Bert, who, by the way, holds the post of Minister of Public Instruction and Worship! Their prominence has been acquired and retained by means too well-known to our readers to need rehearsal. Of the other ministers, we feel assured that their selection was made, if not solely, at all events, principally, on account of their subservience to Gambetta. They are, as their course in the direction of public affairs will no doubt prove, mere creatures of the dictator. We can well understand the hesitancy of Gambetta in assuming office. He aimed at the Presidency of the re-