



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. XXIII.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DEC. 27, 1872.

NO. 20

BOOKS FOR DECEMBER.

- Sadler's New Uniform and Complete Edition of LOVER'S WORKS, Comprising Rory O'Moore, Handy Andy, Treasure Trove, Legends and Stories of Ireland; Poetical Works, 6 vols. in Box. Per vol. 1 00
THE LIFE OF FATHER MATHEW, the People's Sogarth Aroon. By Sister Mary Frances Clare, Author of Life of St. Patrick, etc. 75
THE HEART OF MYRRHA LAKE; or, Into the Light of Christianity. By Minnie Mary Lee. 1 00
THE LIFE AND TIMES OF POPE SIXTUS THE FIFTH. By Baron Hubner, Late Ambassador of Austria at Paris and at Rome. Translated from the original French by James F. Melino. 1 00
FLEURANGE, By Madame Augustus Craven Author of "A Sister's Story," etc. 1 50
ALL-HALLOW'S EVE; or, The Test of Futurity, and other Stories. 2 00
THE HISTORY OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. Translated from the French of Orsini, by Very Rev. F. C. Husebeth. 2 00
THE ILLUSTRATED CATHOLIC FAMILY ALMANAC for 1873. 25
THE CATHOLIC WORLD. Contents:—The Spirit of Protestantism; Fleurance; Sayings of John Climacus; Dante's Purgatorio; Sanscrit and the Vedas; The House that Jack Built; St. Peter's Roman Pontificate; Sayings; The Progressionists; Christian Art of the Catacombs; Bussing the Air; A Retrospect; The Russian Clergy; The Cross Through Love and Love Through the Cross; Odd Stories; Signs of the Times; New Publications, etc. Terms, per annum. 4 50
Single Copies 45
Sent free by Mail on receipt of price. D. & J. SADLER & CO., Montreal.

FATHER BURKE. THE FINAL LECTURE.

CRUSHING REPLY TO MR. FROUDE.

Ireland Since the Union, Ireland To-Day, and Ireland of the Future.

THE VOLUNTEERS OF '82.—GENERAL REVIEW OF THE WHOLE SUBJECT.—MACAULAY'S NEW ZEALANDER.—MR. FROUDE AS A PHILOSOPHER.—DISASTROUS EFFECTS OF THE UNION UPON IRISH INDUSTRIAL RESOURCES.

(From the N. Y. Metropolitan Record.)

The series of lectures delivered in answer to Mr. Froude, by the Very Rev. Father Burke, came to a conclusion on Tuesday evening, Nov. 26th, in the Academy of Music. Notwithstanding the wintry state of the weather the edifice was literally jammed with an immense audience, every foot of space being occupied in less than thirty minutes after the opening of the doors. On the stage, among the many distinguished individuals in attendance, were Vicar-General Starrs, Bishop Becker of Wilmington, and prominent representatives of the Catholic clergy of the Dioceses of New York and Brooklyn. John Mitchel, the eminent Irish patriot and historian, occupied one of the boxes with his family, and when a graceful tribute was paid to him by the lecturer of the evening in quoting from his "History of Ireland," the audience received the sentiment with cheering response. The lecture was over two hours in length; but with such an audience to inspire him, the lecturer, if his endurance could have held out, might have retained them two hours longer, so appreciative and enthusiastic was the delivery of this final appeal to America received by them. He spoke as follows:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: On this day a paragraph in a newspaper, the New York Tribune, was brought under my notice, and the reading of it caused me very great pain and anguish of mind; for it recorded an act of discourtesy offered to my learned antagonist, Mr. Froude, and supposed to be offered by Irishmen in Boston. In the name of the Irishmen of America I tender to the learned gentleman my best apologies. I beg to assure him that we are only too happy to offer to him the courtesy and the hospitality which Ireland has never refused even to her enemies. (Applause.) Mr. Froude does not come amongst us as an enemy of Ireland, but he professes that he loves the Irish people, and I am willing to believe him; and when I read in the report of his last lecture to which I am about to answer to-night, that he said that he "would yield to no man in his love for the Irish people," I was reminded of what O'Connell said to Lord Derby on a similar occasion, when the noble Lord stated in the House of Lords that he would yield to no man in his love for Ireland. The great Tribune rose and said: "Any man that loves Ireland cannot be my enemy; let our

hearts shake hands." (Applause.) I am sure, therefore, that I speak the sentiments of every true Irishman in America when I assure this learned English gentleman that as long as he is in this country he will receive at the hands of the Irish citizens of America nothing but the same courtesy, the same polite hospitality and attention which he boasts that he has received from the Irish people in their native land. (Applause.) I beg to assure him that we Irishmen in America know well that it is not by discourtesy or violence, that the citizens of America ever expect to make their appeal to this great nation. (Applause.) If ever the reign of intellect and of mind was practically established in this world it is in glorious America. Every man who seeks the truth; every man who preaches the truth, whether it be religious truth or historical truth, will find an audience in America, and I hope he never will find an Irishman to stand up and offer him discourtesy and violence because he speaks what he imagines to be the truth. (Applause.)

So much being said in reference to this paragraph to which I have alluded, I now come to the last of Mr. Froude's lectures and to the last of my own. The learned gentleman in his fourth lecture, told the American people his view of the movement of 1782, and of the subsequent Irish rebellion of 1798. According to Mr. Froude, the Irish made a great mistake in 1782, by asserting the independence of the Irish Parliament. "They abandoned," says this learned gentleman, "the paths of political reform, and they clamored for political agitation."

Now, political agitation is one thing and political reform is another thing. Political reform, my friends, means the correcting of great abuses, the repealing of bad laws and the passing of good measures salutary and useful for the welfare and well-being of the people. According to this learned gentleman, England was taught by her bitter American experience that coercion will not answer with the people, and that it is impossible to thrust unjust laws upon a people." According to him England was only too willing, too happy, in the year 1780, to repeal all the bad laws that had been passed in the blind and bigoted ages gone by, and to grant to Ireland real redress of all her grievances. "But the Irish people," says Mr. Froude, "instead of demanding from England the redress of this grievance, insisted on their national and parliamentary independence.—And they were fools in this," he said, "for that very independence led to interior contention, contention to conspiracy—conspiracy to rebellion and rebellion to tyranny."

Now, I am as great an enemy of political agitation as Mr. Froude or any other man. I hold and I hold it by experience, that political agitation distracts men's minds from the more serious and more necessary avocations of life; that political agitation distracts men's minds away from their business and from the safer pursuit of industry; ere it creates animosity and bad blood between citizens; that it affords an easy and profitable employment to worthless demagogues, and that it brings very often to the surface the vilest and meanest elements of society. All this I grant. (Applause.) But at the same time I hold that political agitation is the only resource left to a people who are endeavoring to extract good laws from an unwilling and a tyrannical government. (Applause.) May I ask the learned historian what were the wars of the seventeenth century, in France, in Germany and in the Netherlands—the wars that Mr. Froude admires so much, for which he expresses so much sympathy—what were they but political agitation taking the form of armed rebellion, in order to extort from the government of the time what the people believed to be just measures of toleration and liberty of conscience? (Applause.) With these wars that were waged by the people in armed rebellion against France, against Spain and the Netherlands, against the Emperor Charles V., Mr. Froude has the deepest sympathy, because they are wars made by Protestants against Catholic governments. The men who made these wars were innovators—they were revolutionists in every sense of the word; they wanted to overturn not only the altar, but also the established form of government. But when the Irish, who only stood in defence of their ancient religion, of their altars, lives and property, and not of their freedom—for that was long gone—for the Irish to do this, the learned gentleman has not a word, except expressions of disdain and disapprobation. (Hissses.) And now we come to consider, my friends, whether Mr. Froude is right when he says "that the Irish only clamored for political agitation in 1780, when they might have obtained political reform."

Now, mark! In 1780 the Irish people and more especially the Protestant portion of the Irish people, demanded of the English government the repeal of certain laws that restricted and almost annihilated the trade and commerce

of Ireland. These laws had been passed under William III.; they were levelled at the Irish woolen trade; they forbade the exportation of manufactured cloth from Ireland, except under a duty that was equivalent to a prohibition tariff. They went so far as to prohibit the Irish people from selling the very fleece—their wool—selling it to any foreign power except England. England then fixed her price, and as Mr. Froude himself said, although the French might be offering for Irish wool, the Irish merchant could not sell to them, but he was obliged to sell to the English merchant at his own price. When the Irish people demanded this just measure; I ask was England willing to grant it? Was England, as Mr. Froude says, only anxious to discover unjust laws in order to repeal them, and to discover grievances in order to redress them? I answer: No! England nailed her colors to the mast. She said: "I never will grant a repeal of restriction duties on Irish trade. Ireland is down, and I will keep her down!" (Hissses.)

The proof lies here. The English Government resisted Grattan's demand for the emancipation of Irish industry until Henry Grattan brought 50,000 volunteers, and the very day that he rose in the Irish Parliament and proclaimed that Ireland demanded her commercial rights, the Volunteers in College Green and St. Stephen's Green in Dublin had their artillery out and planted at the gates of the English House of Commons, and around the mouths of the cannons was tied a label, a significant label—"Free trade for Ireland or—" (Great and prolonged applause.) (A Voice—"We mean it.") If England was so willing to redress every Irish grievance, and if the Irish people had only to say: "Look here, there is this law in existence, take it away for it is strangling and destroying the trade of this country?"—if England was so willing to take away that law—if she was only anxious to hear of a bad law only to remedy it, in the name of God, why, on that day, in 1780, did she hold out until, at the very cannon's mouth, she was obliged to yield commercial independence to Ireland? (Great applause.) Is it any wonder that the Irish people thought, with Henry Grattan, that, if every measure of reform was to be obtained from England in this way, the kingdom would always be kept in a state of perpetual revolution? Is it any wonder that men said: "Why, if we have to go out to fight for every law, to demand every act of justice, we must always be ready with our torches lighted and our cannons loaded?" Is it any wonder that the Irish people said in that day, with their immortal leader: "It is far better for us to have our own Parliament free and independent, to take up the making of our own laws, to consult our own interest, and in peace and harmony to take thought of the wants of Ireland and to legislate for them?" And that is what Mr. Froude calls "clamoring for political agitation." Thus we see, my friends—remember this evening, fellow-countrymen, that I am emphatically and especially appealing to America; but I expect my verdict this evening, as Mr. Froude got his—(great applause)—and it is not from Dr. Hitch-cock. (Uproarious laughter.) It is not the puny crow of a barn-door fowl, but it is the screaming of America's eagle that I expect it from. (Tremendous cheers, renewed and prolonged for several minutes.)

A Voice—"Faugh a ballagh!" Thus we see from the action of 1782, by which Grattan obtained chiefly the independence of the Irish Parliament, did not originate in any innate love of the Irish for political agitation, but in the action of the British Government that forced on them only two alternatives—"Remain subject to me, to my Parliament, but I never will give you anything except at the cannon's mouth; or you will have to take your own liberty and legislate for yourselves." Oh! Henry Grattan, you were not a Catholic, and yet I, a Catholic priest, here to-night call down ten thousand blessings on thy name and on thy memory. (Immense applause.) It is true that the emancipated Parliament of 1782 failed to realize the hopes of the Irish nation. Perfectly true. The Parliament of '82 was a failure. I grant it. Mr. Froude says that that was a failure because the Irish were incapable of self-legislation. (Hissses.) It is a serious charge to make against any people, my friends, yet I, who am not supposed to be a philosopher—and because of the habit I wear, am not supposed to be a man of very large mind—I stand up here to-night and assert my conviction that there is not a nation nor a race under the sun that is not capable of self-legislation, and that has not a right to the inheritance of freedom. (Great applause.) And if the learned gentleman wishes to know what was the real cause of that failure, I will tell him. (Laughter.) The emancipated parliament of 1782, although it enclosed within its walls such honored names as Grattan and Flood, yet did not represent the Irish nation. There were nearly three millions and a half of Irishmen in Ireland at that day. Three millions were Catholics and

half a million Protestants, and the parliament of 1782 only represented the half million. (Hissses.) Nay, more, examine the constitution of that parliament, and see who they were; see how they were elected, and you will find that not even the half million of Protestants were represented in that parliament. The House of Commons held three hundred members. Of these three hundred, only seventy-two were elected by the people; the rest were the nominees of certain great lords—certain large landed proprietors. A man happened to have an estate on the side of the country which contained three or four towns and villages, and each town returned its member. A landlord went in and said, "You will elect such a man, who is my nominee," and he was elected at once. They were called "rotten boroughs" and "nomination boroughs," and they were also called "pocket boroughs," because my lord had them in his pocket. (Laughter.) Have any of you Irishmen who are present here to-night ever travelled from Dublin to Drogheda? There is a miserable village of half a dozen wretched huts. It is in the dirtiest, filthiest place I ever saw, and that miserable village returned a member to the Irish parliament. (Hissses.) Did that parliament of '82 represent the Irish people? Three millions of Catholics had not as much as a vote. The best and most intellectual Catholic in Ireland had not even a vote for a member of parliament. Had that parliament represented the Irish people they would have solved the problem of home rule in a sense favorable to Ireland, and very unfavorable to the theories of Mr. Froude. (Applause.) The Irish people knew this well, and the moment that the parliament of '82 were declared independent of the Parliament of England—were declared to have the power of originating their own acts of legislation, and to be responsible to no one but the king, that moment the Irish people clamored for reform. They said, reform yourselves. Reform the parliament. Let the people be represented there fairly, and you will make a great success in your independence. The Volunteers of their own accord cried out for reform. The very first meeting at Dungannon, when they were ninety-five thousand strong—the only thing they demanded was reform of the parliament. (Applause.) The united Irishmen—(great applause)—who, in the beginning, were not a secret society nor a treasonable society, but open, free, loyal men, embracing the first names and the first characters in Ireland, the united Irishmen actually originated as a society embracing the best intellect in Ireland for the purpose of forcing reform in the Parliament. [Applause.] It may be interesting to the citizens of America who have honored me with their presence this evening, it may be interesting to my Irish fellow-countrymen to know what were the three principles upon which the united society of Irishmen was formed. Here they are, listen to me: First of all—the first resolution of that society was that "the weight of English influence in this government and the government of this country, is so great as to require cordial union amongst all the people of Ireland, to maintain that balance which is essential to the preservation of our liberties and to the extension of our commerce." Resolution No. 2: "That the only constitutional means by which this influence of England can be opposed is by complete, cordial and radical reform of the representation of the people in Parliament." Resolution No. 3: "That no reform is just which does not include every Irishman of every religious persuasion." [Great applause.] There you have the whole programme of this formidable society of United Irishmen. I ask you, people of America, was there anything treasonable in this, was there anything reprehensible, was there anything deserving of imprisonment, banishment or death in such resolutions as these. [Loud cries of no! no!] Who opposed and hindered that reform? Who stood between the Irish people and their Parliament and said, "No, There will be no reform. They must remain the representatives of a faction and not of the nation. They must remain the corrupt and venal representatives of a small portion even of the Protestant faction?" Who said this? The Government of England. [Hissses.] Here is my proof: On the 29th of November, 1783, Mr. Flood introduced into the Irish Parliament a bill of reform. The moment that bill was read an honorable member rose up to oppose it, and that member was Barry Yelverton, who was afterwards created Lord Avonmore. He was the Attorney-General of Ireland. He gave to the reform bill an official governmental opposition, when the bill was thrown out by a majority of 159 to 77—the 159—every man of them having the bribe in his pocket. [Laughter and hissses.] Then the Attorney-General, Mr. Yelverton, rose up and made this motion: "It had now become necessary to declare that this House would maintain its rights and privileges against all encroachments whatsoever." The "just rights and privileges were, repre-

sented a faction to the exclusion of over five-sixths of the people of Ireland." "From agitation," says Mr. Froude, "grew conspiracy; from conspiracy, rebellion." By conspiracy he means the society of United Irishmen; by the rebellion he means the uprising of 1798. Now, in my last lecture I have shown by the evidence of such men as Sir Ralph Abercrombie and Sir John Moore, the hero of Corunna, that the rebellion of '98 was previously and originally the work of the British Government, which goaded the Irish people into rebellion. And we have also seen, a moment ago, that the United Irishmen was not a conspiracy, but a public society, a magnificent reunion of the best men and the best intellect in Ireland for a splendid purpose to be accomplished by fair, loyal and legitimate means. [Applause.] But the principle on which the United Irishmen were formed was the principle of effecting a union amongst all Irishmen, and this was enough to alarm the Government which, from time immemorial and for many centuries, had ruled Ireland. The motto, the word which Mr. Froude so wisely said: "In that day, when Irishmen are united, Ireland will be invincible"—that was present in the mind of every man of them. England's Prime Minister, the celebrated Mr. Pitt, then resolved upon three things. He resolved, first, to disarm the volunteers; secondly, to force the United Irishmen to become a secret society or conspiracy; and, thirdly, through them to force Ireland into a revolt, that he might have her at his feet. How did he bring these three things about? Remember, I am reviewing all this historically. I have no prejudice in the matter. I declare to you, with the exception of the private ebullition of feeling—boiling up of feeling in my study, when I am perusing and preparing these lectures, I feel nothing about them. I am not like others. I believe, for instance, that Mr. Froude has no business to write history, because he is a good philosopher. A philosopher is a man who endeavors to trace effects to their causes—who has a theory and tries to work it out; he is the last man in the world who ought to write history. [Laughter.] And why? Because a historian is supposed to be a dry narrator of facts, and not to deal in theories or fancies at all. I believe that my learned antagonist is too good a philosopher to be a good historian—[laughter]—and I also believe that he is too good a historian to be a good philosopher. [Great applause and laughter.]

The first of these three designs Mr. Pitt accomplished. In 1785 he increased the standing army in Ireland to fifteen thousand men, and he obtained from the Irish Parliament a grant of twenty thousand pounds to clothe and organize a militia. Between the army on one side and the militia on the other, he took the volunteers between them in the centre, and they were disarmed. In the day when the last volunteer laid down his musket, Ireland's hopes for the time were laid down with it.

The second of these, namely: the forcing of the United Irishmen into a conspiracy, he effected in this manner: In February, 1793, he passed two bills through Parliament, called the "Gunpowder bill" and the "Convention bill." A public meeting of the United Irishmen was held in Dublin—a public meeting with nothing secret about it—to protest against the inquisitorial measures of certain agents of a secret committee of the House of Lords—men who were going into peoples' houses at any hour of the day or night without any warrant or authority, on the pretended information that there was gunpowder concealed in the house.—(Laughter.) For this public meeting, held legally and constitutionally, the Hon. Mr. Simon Butler, who was president of the meeting, and Mr. Oliver Bond, who was secretary of the meeting, were imprisoned for six months and fined £500 each. When this illustrious society found that they were thus persecuted, they were obliged to take refuge in secrecy, and thus it was that the United Irishmen were forced to become a conspiracy.

The first really treasonable project that was ever put before the United Irishmen, was put before them in April, 1794, by the Rev. William Jenkins, a Protestant clergyman, who came over commissioned by the French Convention, and the Rev. Mr. Jenkins was accompanied in that mission by John Cockayne, an English lawyer from London, who was the agent of William Pitt, the Prime Minister of England. Thus did the society of United Irishmen become the seat of conspiracy, and this was the action of the English government. Before that it was perfectly legitimate and constitutional. Ah! but it had an object which was far more formidable to the English government than any action of treason. The English government is not afraid of Irish treason, but the English government trembles with fear at the idea of Irish union. (Applause.) The United Irishmen were founded to promote union amongst Irishmen of every religion, and the Englishman has said in his own mind: "Treason is better than union; it will force them to