

### The Catholic Record

Published every Friday morning at 422 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 noon of each week.

THOS. COFFEY,  
Publisher and Proprietor.

#### 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 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, APRIL 9, 1880.

#### THE FALL OF BEACONSFIELD.

Lord Beaconsfield, with that adroitness characteristic of his entire political life, made his appeal to the electorate when all things seemed to favor and to promise success to the party over which he holds a sway so absolute. The Liberal party had not yet recovered from the disorganization which followed Mr. Gladstone's withdrawal from the leadership some years ago, nor had it, by propounding a just, liberal and comprehensive policy on Irish questions, such as had brought a glorious victory to its standards in 1868, secured the alliance and support of the Irish party in the House of Commons. The Liberals had been preparing for battle in early Autumn, but abandoned their preparations as soon as it was officially announced that another session of the moribund Parliament was to be held. The Home Rulers were not in any more advantageous position, in the face of a contest, so sharply sprung upon them, than the Liberal opposition. The death of Mr. Butt had left them without a leader of that commanding intellect and superior Parliamentary influence and experience so necessary to a rising and aggressive party. There were, besides, indications of discord in the ranks, which could not but prove in the last degree injurious to the course the whole party professed to have at heart.

Parliament commenced its work without any presentiment of impending doom. A scheme of Irish relief ungenerous in the extreme, and an unprecedented restriction of the rights of individual members and of minorities in the House of Commons, made up the "policy" of the government, as far as domestic affairs were concerned. A programme so exceedingly anti-Irish would, it was thought, commend itself to the favor of the British public. Parliament was then suddenly dissolved. Lord Beaconsfield, in a letter to the Duke of Marlborough, appealed to the country on the distinct issue of Imperialism in foreign and domestic politics. In that skillfully-prepared document he alluded to the dangers of the disintegration of the Empire by any concessions to the Home Rule party, vaguely insinuating that as the Liberals had favored colonial severance from the mother country, they were now conniving at the introduction of a similar policy in the Imperial realms. In foreign affairs he declared it his purpose to maintain the ascendancy of England. With an appeal so adroitly addressed to the prejudices of the English people, Beaconsfield went to the country with every promise and prospect of success. The contest had not, however, well begun, when cautious observers discerned the real state of public opinion. Mr. Gladstone, on his tour through Scotland, was everywhere received with the same unbounded enthusiasm which marked his first progress through that kingdom. His vigorous condemnation of the policy of the government, foreign and domestic, was in all places received with that spontaneous approval which betokens unanimity and foreshadows the widest acceptance. In his first visit to Scotland he laid down the policy which should guide the action of the Liberal party if again entrusted with the seals of office. In his second visit to the same country he covered the same ground, re-asserting all that he had in the first affirmed, as to the course a British Administration should pursue in foreign and in domestic affairs. The views of so distinguished a man, even were he to remain a prominent figure in opposition to the existing administration, would certainly merit the closest attention, but when his views have received the direct and emphatic approval of a great nation, an approval freely expressed as the result of an unalterable determination, they call not only for attention, but for the deepest reflection.

At Edinburgh, Mr. Gladstone, dilating on the foreign policy of the Beaconsfield Administration, thus defined the duty of government in foreign affairs: "The great duty of government, especially in foreign affairs," Mr. Gladstone proceeded to declare, "is to soothe and tranquillize the minds of the people, not to set up false phantoms of glory which are to delude them into calamity; not to flatter their infirmities by leading them to believe that they are better than the rest of the world, and so to encourage the baleful spirit of domination, but to proceed upon the principle which recognizes the sisterhood and equality of nations, the absolute equality of public right amongst them, and above all to endeavor to produce and maintain a temper so calm and so deliberate in the public opinion of the country, that none shall be able to disturb it."

Developing this consideration, the Liberal leader makes the following statement well worthy the most serious reflection:—"There is no precedent in human history for a formation like the British Government. A small Island at one extremity of the globe, peoples the whole earth with its colonies, but it is not satisfied with that. It goes among the ancient races of Asia, and it subjects 240,000,000 to its rule there. Along with all this it disseminates over the world a commerce such as no imagination ever conceived in former times, and such as no poet ever painted. And all this it has had to do with a strength that lies within the narrow limits of these shores, not a strength that I disparage; on the contrary, I wish to dissipate if I can the idle dreams of those who are always telling you that the strength of England depends, sometimes, they say, on its prestige; sometimes, they say, upon its extending its Empire, and upon what it possesses beyond these shores. Rely upon it, the strength of Great Britain and Ireland is within the United Kingdom."

His arraignment of the foreign policy of the Beaconsfield Government is condensed into these words spoken at Dalkeith:—"Since 1874, I make this complaint, that the shoulders, so to speak, of this nation, have been loaded by a multitude of gratuitous, mischievous, and dangerous engagements. I point to Africa, I point to India, I point to Afghanistan, to Syria, to Asia Minor, to the whole of Turkey in Asia. I point to our assumption practically (and in alliance with France more critical in its nature) our virtual assumption of the government of Egypt; I point to our practical annexation of the Island of Cyprus, to all the military dangers and responsibilities of undertaking the defence of the Turkish frontier in Armenia, in fact to an enormous increase of difficulty and labor all over the world."

The views of Mr. Gladstone on the domestic affairs of the United Kingdom differ as radically as his views on foreign policy from those propounded and acted upon by Lord Beaconsfield.

On the subject of Home Rule we find this eminent statesman making the following explicit declaration:—"If you ask me what I think of Home Rule, I must tell you that I will only answer you when you tell me how Home Rule is related to Local Government. I am friendly to Local Government. I am friendly to large local prerogatives. I desire,

I may say I intensely desire, to see Parliament relieved of some portion of its duties. I see the efficiency of Parliament interfered with, not only by obstruction from Irish members, but by the enormous weight that is placed on the time and shoulders and minds of those you send to represent you. We have got an overweighted Parliament, and if Ireland or any other portion of the country is desirous, and able so to arrange its affairs as to take the local portion of some part of its transactions off Parliament, it would liberate and strengthen Parliament for Imperial concerns."

On another important subject, that of peasant proprietorships, Mr. Gladstone expresses his views with the emphasis and lucidity so characteristic of his utterances:—"It is fair," he points out, "that justice should be done to peasant proprietors. It is an excellent thing, capable of doing good in many points. It interests a number of people in the soil of the country. But look at the effect it has on the progressive value of the land. . . . In 1857 the agricultural income of France was £76,000,000. It was greater in 1851 than the whole income from land and homes together had been in 1821. . . . In 1864 it had risen from £76,000,000 to £106,000,000. . . . In 1842 the agricultural income of England was £42,000,000, in 1876 it was £52,000,000, that is to say, while the agricultural income of France increased forty per cent. in thirteen years the agricultural income of England increased twenty per cent. in thirty-four years. The increase in France was three per cent. per annum; the increase in England was about a half or three-fifths per cent. per annum. . . . what I wish to insist upon is that when we see the vast increase of the agricultural valuation of France, it has not been on the large holdings, but has been mainly owing to what has been done on the part of the peasant proprietors, whom some are so anxious to deny."

These views, placed in so able a manner before the British people, evidently took deeper root in the public mind than was at first supposed. The daily returns of elections show that the great influence of Mr. Gladstone over his fellow-countrymen has not suffered any diminution.

But it was not against Mr. Gladstone alone, or against Mr. Bright and the other prominent members of the Liberal party, that Lord Beaconsfield had to battle. His electoral manifesto, breathing in every line the most intense hostility to Ireland and to Irish aspirations, provoked several stirring appeals to Irishmen from their political leaders. If the Liberal majority in many of the English boroughs astounded even the party managers themselves, they may without much difficulty find what cause contributed to this augmentation of their strength and the victory they achieved. That cause was the unanimity and determination of the Irish electors everywhere throughout the United Kingdom. The Home Rule confederation of Great Britain, just previous to the elections, issued a manifesto to the Irish electors, bitterly denouncing Lord Beaconsfield and his ministry. This manifesto characterized the letter of the Premier to the Duke of Marlborough as a "declaration of war" upon Irishmen, their country, and their friends. It denounced the Administration as a "ministry of misfortune," seeking, after "six years of feebleness and cruelty abroad and sham legislation at home," a renewal of public confidence by sowing "discord and hatred between Englishmen and Irishmen." The closing appeal of this manifesto has evidently received from Irishmen in Great Britain a loyal response:

"You should vote against the common enemy of your country and your race. Vote against the unscrupulous intriguer, whose character was so exactly divined by O'Connell. . . . Let no nominee or supporter of his be aided by any vote of yours to swell his evil power. Every Irishman who loves Ireland, every Irishman who seeks and appreciates the friendship of honest Englishmen and Scotchmen, will oppose the common enemy of the peace and concord of Ireland and Great Britain."

Mr. Shaw, in his address to the electors of the county of Cork, placed

the issue before his constituents and the Irish public in a clear and statesmanlike manner. His vigorous impeachment of the Government may be summed up in these words:

"The country wants a government that will preserve the integrity of the Empire, not by attempted repression and reaction, but by dispensing strict and impartial justice to all classes and all parts of the Empire, which will be strong at home in the confidence of a prosperous, enlightened, and moral people; strong abroad by a firm and resolute protection of our best interests, and a generous alliance with freedom."

The address of the Irish Land League, an ably conceived and judiciously worded document, must have likewise done its share to secure the downfall of the Government. That address appealed to the Irish people to support no candidates but those in accord with popular sentiment on the land question. In reference to the land laws the address declared:

"We call upon you to carry your warfare against these monstrous laws into the ballot box as well, and record your votes under its protecting secrecy, as you have raised your voices during the past year against every supporter of an institution that is the deadliest enemy from which a people ever struggled to be liberated."

The triumph of the Liberal party, achieved through Irish energy, Irish enmity and Irish determination, is one of the most significant facts in the political history of Great Britain. Lord Beaconsfield had appealed to the nation on a policy directly adverse to the well-known views of the Irish political leaders. He appealed to the English people to declare their purpose to maintain the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament over even the smallest local concerns of Ireland. He appealed to the land law class to resist any modification of the land laws. He appealed to passion, prejudice, and interest.

Powerful as are these factors in every election contest, they were not in this struggle powerful enough to overcome the indignation of an insulted and injured race. Beaconsfield has fallen again by Irish resolution, Irish courage, and Irish exasperation. In 1868 he appealed to England to preserve Protestant ascendancy in Ireland. But the manly sense of justice of the British people answered him by refusing confidence to his administration. The ascendancy he then propped up soon crumbled to atoms.

In 1880 he appealed to English prejudices against Irish self-government and against the establishment of an Irish peasant proprietor. Again he has received an answer doing honor to the British nation. The successful party come into power pledged to a liberal measure of land tenure for Ireland, and to an energetic and comprehensive effort to establish in that country a peasant proprietary as happy as prosperous, and as law-abiding as that of France. With a land scheme so just, so generous, and so well-timed, who can say what is in store for Ireland. Too long has she worn the sackcloth and the ashes of servitude. Too long has she sat in mourning and in anguish weeping over famine, decay, and retrogression.

May we not venture to declare, that by the generous union of her own faithful sons with the liberty-loving of the sons of Britain, her chains have been broken and her weeds of sorrow cast to the winds. The vision which to-day fills our minds is that of an Ireland emancipated, regenerated, and redeemed, an Ireland in loveliness, majesty, and freedom, without a peer even in this age of social and political phenomena.

#### THE SALVATION ARMY.

They are sowing on them. The "Salvation Army" came to New York with a great flourish of bugles, and now even the weak-minded men who imagined they saw something divine in the expedition have been forced so condemn the farce as not only very silly but very unchristianlike. The following we clip from the *Christian Guardian* of last week: "Railton, the leader of the detachment of the 'Salvation Army' operating in New York, has been acting in a fanatical and imprudent manner. An ordinance of the city prohibits preaching on the streets, because it was found that such assemblages of people interfered with the traffic of the public thoroughfares. The Mayor enforced the law against Railton, who immediately sent that official a command in the name of the Lord to remove the prohibition. Some who were willing to give their sympathy to the work, if it proved its usefulness, have been alienated. The *Methodist* says: 'The Salvation Army' from London is making religion ridiculous in New York, though these 'captains' and 'lieutenants' are doubtless sincere

enough. We do not object to ignorant advocates of Christ in the proper place; but it is no part of our religion to give prominence to ignorance. This style of thing may do well enough for the mobs of London; but its usefulness in American cities has yet to be proven."

#### DIVORCE.

The French Republic and the Italian kingdom, states of the one stock and origin—undiluted radicalism—are at this moment agitated on the subject of divorce. Needless to say that the so-called friends of progress in these countries are enthusiastically in favor of the introduction of such amendments to the marriage laws as will facilitate the severance of the marriage upon any and almost every pretext.

Divorce, even in cases of grave criminal dereliction on the part of either husband or wife, is permitted in the Catholic Church, only *quoad mensam, et thorum*—every marriage validly contracted being indissoluble *quoad vinculum* until the death of either of the contracting parties. The effect of divorce laws which alienate from the marriage contract this saving feature of indissolubility, is to put a premium on crime. The dissolute husband and the unfaithful wife are thus encouraged to the commission of crimes which, if proven or admitted, nullify according to these laws, a union rendered hateful and burdensome by their own criminality.

If these infamous laws, for infamous they are, viewed from whatever standpoint soever—destructive of the peace of families, the happiness of individuals and the solid growth of nations: if, we say, these laws existed not, how many of the scandals which now shock public sensibility, were avoided—how many hopes now blasted and aspirations crushed were still living and blossoming full of vigor and promise, to buoy fidelity and adorn true love.

Radicalism, whether under the cover of royalty in Italy, or republicanism in France, by its approval and advocacy of the modern system of divorce, stamps itself, notwithstanding its loud protestations to the contrary, as the enemy of that family peace, without which national advancement were illusory and short-lived. If the legislators of these states of Europe, wherein no hardships which existing laws cannot remove disturbs the marital relations of the people, look to the operations of the licentious system of divorce prevailing in America, they can learn a lesson of practical wisdom of very great service at the present juncture. In the State of Ohio alone, for every ten marriages, there is one divorce suit, while the proportion of divorces, actually granted, to marriages in the same State is as one to seventeen. In 1878, 25,796 marriages were contracted in that State, while 2,624 divorce suits were instituted—in addition to 1,349 pending from former years. The number of divorces granted in 1878 in the same State was 1,432.

If French and Italian statesmen were actuated by motives of public good, if their sole desire and aim were to promote public welfare on the basis of morality, they might from these figures learn that the best interests of the people—interests springing from family security and contentment—cannot be advanced by trampling under foot the precepts of the Gospel. But we mistake; with their names the Gospel cannot be associated. They are of those who hold that as the Pagan systems of antiquity had, under the influence of Augustan literature and learning, lost their influence, for good by losing all claims to respect, the Christian religion has also served its turn, having ceased to be respected because, forsooth, they revile its sacred teachings.

The statesman, actuated by the desire of promoting the growth and happiness of the people, through hatred of Christianity and studied resistance to its dictates, must, by the very position he thus assumes, deprive the government he administers of its strongest support and most lasting security. That government which does not enjoy the religious and conscientious support of its subjects is a government either whose origin is due to plunder, spoliation, and perforce massacre, or whose administration is

such an unbroken perversion of justice as to deprive it in the first instance of respect, and in the latter of confidence. Such are to-day the governments of France and Italy.

The establishment of the free-and-easy system of divorce prevailing among our American neighbors might indeed make these nations progressive in the communistic sense, but with such a system degrading manhood and perverting womanhood, would these nations be happy?

#### THE RECALL OF COUNT ORLOFF.

The recall of Count Orloff, Russian envoy to Paris, consequent upon the refusal of the French Government to extradite Hartmann, is the strongest declaration of dissatisfaction with the course of the French Government, to which the Russian cabinet could have recourse. The French Government, in refusing to extradite the offending Nihilist, extended beyond due bounds the right of asylum guaranteed to political refugees and offenders. While civilized nations generally extend this right of asylum with becoming cordiality to unfortunate political offenders of every race, they cannot and ought not to be expected to tolerate assassination as a legitimate mode of warfare even for rebels. That Nihilism employs assassination as its surest and most trusted weapon, all who study the action of the conspirators must confess. No one can deny that Russian subjects, if aggrieved, have the right by every legitimate means to insist upon the removal of their grievances, and all must admire that generous sentiment of hospitality which would give the sacred right of refuge in foreign countries to those who unsuccessfully maintain what they consider their rights against an existing form of oppression. In the case of Hartmann the question which engaged attention was, whether the French Government could extend to a member of a society concerned in several attempts to destroy the life of the sovereign of a friendly State, the same right of asylum guaranteed to other offenders. It seems to us that the French Government, in refusing to extradite Hartmann, laid down a very dangerous precedent. If every State were to act on the principle which guided the French cabinet in the solution of this question, nothing could prevent the formation of conspiracies with the object of assassination and massacre in one State to operate in another contiguous State. No one can be blind to the results to which such a contingency should lead. The truth is, the French cabinet feared the displeasure of its communist supporters, and ruled accordingly in favor of Hartmann, who holds unwavering faith in dynamite to overturn governments and extirpate dynasties. The Russian Government, therefore, adopted a dignified course in recalling Count Orloff.

#### CUSTOMS APPRAISERSHIP OF QUEBEC.

We notice the name of Mr. Giblin prominently mentioned in connection with this position. We should be pleased indeed to notice the appointment of this gentleman. In every respect he would be most suitable. Having been engaged for a number of years in the grocery and liquor business, his fitness is a matter that cannot be questioned. Apart from this, the fact of the office having been successively filled by two Frenchmen, an Englishman and a Scotchman, would lead us to expect that the claims of an Irishman would now be recognized, more particularly as the gentleman in question has ever been a friend and strong supporter of the party in power. We are often told that there should be no mention made of nationality in connection with the civil service. This sounds all very well in theory. But somehow nationality has always carried considerable weight. So long as this is the case, we desire that all should be treated alike. Irishmen claim a fair share. They do not want any more—they will not be satisfied with less. We are sure that in the present case they will duly appreciate the appointment of such a man as Mr. Giblin.

SACRED HEART ACADEMY.—On the 15th of the present month a new quarter begins at the above academy, in this city. This will be a good time to commence. For particulars, address Lady Superior, or consult any of the priests of the diocese. See advertisement.