

The Catholic Record
Published every Friday morning at 28 Richmond Street.

Annual subscription \$2.00
Six months 1.00
ADVERTISING RATES.

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.

LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSH.

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 not change in its one 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.

Yours very sincerely,
+ JOHN WALSH,
Bishop of London.

Catholic Record.
LONDON, FRIDAY, FEB. 18, 1881.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

It is difficult to see what good purpose the Governments ought to serve in prohibiting freedom of speech in the House of Commons. The Home Rule party certainly took advantage of the forms of the House to protect the rights of the people they represent. But this is precisely what any minority has a right to do. Cases may arise, and in fact have arisen, in which it is the burden duty of the minority to use every available means to arrest the progress of measures obnoxious to the people. The Irish party are not numerous when compared with the British majority. But if the latter represent the British people, the former represent the Irish nation. A whole nation cannot be crushed, its power of speech cannot be taken away or even abridged by so autocratic an individual as the speaker of the House of Commons. We are strongly of the opinion that the liberal party will yet regret its course in assisting to deprive Parliament of its full right of discussion. A Tory majority may yet occupy the benches to the right of the speaker, and with the means now provided by their opponents for the purpose, sternly repress discussion on measures of a retrogressive character. The New York Herald has obtained the opinions of American authorities on the action of the speaker in arbitrarily closing discussion and ordering a division on the introduction of the Irish Coercion act, in mockery entitled "an act for the protection of life and property in Ireland." Ex-speaker Schuyler Colfax declares that no American speaker would attempt such a ruling against a minority. John M. Barclay, an eminent authority, says that the speaker's action was arbitrary—while Col. Forney remarks that if a speaker in the American republic acted in such a manner he would be impeached or killed. The opinions of such well-known American parliamentarians are well worthy the attention of the British people. The House of Commons is no longer the refuge of freedom. From it free speech has been expelled. Parliamentary government has been dealt a fatal blow and the people cruelly wronged.

A DIGNIFIED PROTEST.

The protest of the Irish members, removed in contravention of all Parliamentary precedent from the Commons Chamber, is a document creditable to those outraged gentlemen and well worthy careful perusal and reflection. It is the protest of the representatives of a nation resolved at any sacrifice to exhaust every peaceful means to obtain justice. The protest recites the cause of the ejection from Parliament of the representatives of the Irish people, and advises the nation, wronged and insulted in the person of its chosen representatives, still to abstain from violence and illegality of every kind. We give the document in full. It is brief but spirited and dignified. "Fellow-Countrymen.—At a moment when too many acts of the Irish Executive abrogate the law and tend to drive you

from positions of constitutional action, the reign of force has been inaugurated against us as your representatives here on the floor of the House of Commons. A proposal to depart from the ordinary and legitimate procedure of Parliament, and to suppress at a stroke the liberties of our country, has imposed upon us duties from which we could not shrink. Strictly and admittedly confining ourselves within the rules and laws of parliamentary action we resisted those flagrant proceedings. Only by resorting to open illegality could our efforts be defeated. On Wednesday last, in violation of the laws and liberties of Parliament, the voice of the Irish representatives was arbitrarily silenced, not to facilitate an effort of useful legislation for the English people which has always received our advocacy and support, but in order that a Coercion Act for Ireland might be forced through the Legislature. Last evening we thirty-five, your representatives, claiming our right within the rules and precedents of this assembly, were removed by force from the chamber, and a scene recalling the worst days of the Stuarts disgraced the records of Parliament. Advantage was taken of our enforced absence to rush through the House resolutions which were designed against Ireland, which vest in an individual autocratic power and deprive us as your representatives of all guarantees of freedom of action or speech. In the midst of such proceedings, the news which reaches us from Ireland daily grows in gravity. Meetings are illegally suppressed, arrests are arbitrarily made. Yesterday a man well known to us and to many of you during these recent events as the councillor of tolerance, restraint, and prudence, has been seized without warning and flung back into the horrors of penal servitude. Fellow-countrymen, we adjure you in the midst of these trials and provocations to maintain the noble attitude that has already assisted your ultimate victory, to reject every temptation to conflict, disorder, and crime, and not to be terrorized by the brief reign of despotism. If you be true to yourselves your triumph is certain. To our countrymen in Great Britain we appeal to frustrate all endeavors to excite enmity between them and their English fellow-citizens, among whom many generous voices are even now raised on our behalf. Fellow countrymen, in the discharge of our duties here our attitude and our actions have been and shall be in every instance guided by considerations for your interests. We ask you by your orderly self-restraint, your unshaken organization, your determined perseverance, to strengthen our hands in the struggle we are maintaining."

We hear it said from time to time even by Irishmen that if Ireland were left to herself she would be found incapable of governing. Ireland is well able to govern herself. The action of her representatives in the face of a crying outrage prove them capable of governing in the highest and best sense of the term. Let this address of the Irish members to their people be read with care, and no man who reads it can deny the capacity for government apparent in its every line.

THE SITUATION IN IRELAND.

The Coercion Act may satisfy the landlords—it cannot satisfy the people, nor remove the discontent prevailing in Ireland. The land agitation will certainly lose nothing in strength and influence by the passage of the act. The government has shown its want of statesmanlike capacity in its stern furtherance of this repressive measure, and its utter want of energy in dealing with the land question. The landlord influence in the Cabinet has for the present prevailed, but it has not given ministers any consciousness of increased strength. The situation simply demonstrates the helplessness of the government in its Irish policy. A well-informed and judicious American writer thus discusses the present attitude of the Cabinet on the Irish question:—"About coercion, the English ministry have made up their minds. About the Irish Land bill, they are all at sea. Mr. Gladstone's vague phrases about the amendment of the law of 1870 were but a cover for their indecision. And the Irish members are exhorted to accept the law which places the personal liberty of every Irishman at the mercy of Government officials for two years to come, because this severity is to be atoned for by a bill 'that shape has none, distinguishable in member, joint or limb.' And American newspapers berate the Irish members for refusing to be content. Even Mr. Bright is offended at the Irish and ready for coercion. It is true that the methods of the Land League are not always of a sort to harmonize with Quaker ideas. But the statistics of the last thirty years show that, while Ireland is more aroused and excited than at any time for forty years past, there are fewer agrarian crimes committed than in years of far less excitement. A whole nation cannot be expected to battle for its rights, without leading to acts of violence on the part of the more malevolent or more mercurial elements of society. Every agitator must take the risk of that, just as every nation knows that the organization of an army will be accompanied by certain acts of vice. But the Land League have steadily discouraged such acts. To make them needless, even in the view of the boldheads, they sketched out a simple but effective mode of punishing enemies of the people's cause. But this preventive the English Government are now suppressing by prosecution. Not only are they breaking up the Land League's courts, but they are prosecuting shopkeepers for refusing to have dealings with 'land-grabbers.' Nobody in Ireland may do what he will with his own," except the evicting landlords.

Fifteen years ago, Mr. Bright told the people of Dublin that if their 105 members of Parliament were real representatives of the popular will and were united in their demand, they would be irresistible. But at present nearly every Irish

member unites in demanding a vigorous Land bill, the Northern Liberals putting their demand at Tenant Right and the three P's, Mr. Shaw and his moderates going a little farther still, and Mr. Parnell asking for the expropriation of the landlords. And in face of the united demand for vigor, the Cabinet are divided over the mildest request of the three, the House of Lords having far more to do with the shape of the bill than the whole Irish representation."

The Gladstone "Cabinet," with its large majority, is to all appearances unable to deal vigorously and justly with Ireland. The result is that the Irish people are daily losing confidence in the British government and Parliament. Even the thoughtful amongst the English people are beginning to realize the inexpediency of holding Ireland to a connexion which has brought no honor to Britain and no benefit to Ireland. The writer whom we have just cited shows that the desire for separation is not confined to Ireland.

It is notable that there is a growing feeling in England, which favors the separation of the two countries. Even Mr. Froude, in his reprint of the wretched party pamphlet he put forth as a history of the English in Ireland, after proposing as the best plan military rule for fifty years in the three southern provinces, admits that this is impossible, and adds: "Then Ireland be free." This, too, is called impossible—yet, if we will neither rule Ireland, nor allow the Irish to rule themselves, nature and fact may tell us that, whether we will or no, an experiment which has lasted 700 years shall be tried no longer. Between the two "impossibilities," we may be obliged, to choose, if Ireland is to cease to be our reproach." Mr. Audubon Herbert, M. P., the pronounced Radical, has declared against the policy of governing Ireland by "concessions." "The true and only method," he says, "is to give rights and not favors. You must let her govern herself, even if self-government leads to dire dreams in a paradise of folly, if we think that any coddling which Mr. Gladstone or Mr. Forster can do, is going to prevent this final issue." Sir Wilfrid Lawson, M. P., told his Scotch constituency—"We have tried to rule Ireland for 600 years and have totally failed. We have a rebellion there every eight or ten years, and two armies to keep up—one a military force and the other a constabulary—to keep those people in subjection. It is a heart-rendering state of things, and it cannot much longer go on. If we cannot pacify those people, we cannot go on insisting on holding an unwilling nation under our control; and if it should come to a question of separation or of subjugation, then, far rather than see my fellow-subjects in Ireland crushed down by military force, I, for one, would heartily go for separation of the country from England." To this state of feeling the Home Rulers are contributing by their policy of obstruction. They are making the English Parliament heartily sick of their presence in it, which is a result thoroughly satisfactory to themselves and to their constituents. When Parliament has to remain in continuous session for two nights and three days, to carry a vote over their opposition, all Celtic Ireland is delighted."

We have ourselves always advocated the legislative independence of Ireland; further than this we should not care to go. We believe that with legislative autonomy Ireland would speedily acquire prosperity and peace. The country has been torn with discord, till confidence has left the popular breast and peace abandoned the national heart. Mr. Gladstone has not only disappointed Ireland—he has wronged both Britain and Ireland. His administration is already a huge, but we trust not irreparable wrong.

DEATH OF CARLYLE.

The death of Thomas Carlyle has not taken the world by surprise, nor evoked the same sense of regret it might had it occurred at an earlier period of his career. Mr. Carlyle simply outlived his time. His style was foreign an forcible—but not elegant—while he opinions he sought to propound with so much dogmatism were neither humane nor even Christian. He was a firm believer in the strength of the majority—for the weak he had no other feeling but contempt openly avowed. Autocratic and intolerant to the last degree, Carlyle identified himself with what seemed to him to be the popular ideas of the age. Even his diatribes on the civilization of the day bear this character. To be extreme on the side of might and despotism, whether of the people or of the individual ruler, was evidently the pride of the writer who has just departed this life without the slightest expression of popular regret. Carlyle has been by some pronounced original. He was, indeed, original as far as expression is concerned, but in thought utterly wanting in originality. We cannot deny Carlyle the possession of great talent, extraordinary industry, and unrelenting pertinacity. He opened a new field of literary study and enquiry, not only to English philologists, but to the reading public of Britain generally. The language and literature of Germany received under the impetus created by his Anglo-Germanic style an attention which has been of profit to our mother tongue. We cannot, how-

ever, see that Carlyle left a name likely to be long remembered by the British people. His death creates a vacancy in the ranks of English writers which may not soon be filled, but his absence, regretted as it must be, on account of long personal associations, will not give rise to the poignant feeling of grief an earlier demise might have caused.

THE INDIAN QUESTION.

We referred some weeks ago to the mismanagement of Indian affairs in the American Republic by Secretary Schurz. This gentleman has held office in the Hayes' Cabinet for nearly four years. When he entered on the duties of the high position entrusted to him, he found discontent reigning amongst the Indians, and a general feeling of dissatisfaction amongst all classes of American citizens concerning the previous culpable mismanagement of Indian affairs. Secretary Schurz—if he had divested himself of prejudice and old world reverence for brute force—might have made his administration of Indian matters, if not brilliant, at least creditable. That he has sadly failed as an administrator will be seen from the following strictures from an American source in his dealings with the Poncas:

Mr. Schurz is making bad worse in the matter of the Poncas. It was but natural that he should feel humiliated by the report of the President's Commission, and that he should seek in some way to weaken the force of the blow. That report, including Mr. Allen's statement of the reasons for it, does not merely scatter to the winds all the fine tales we were told about the consent of the Poncas to remain in the Indian Territory. It exposes the methods by which that consent was obtained, showing that the Indians were influenced by the hope raised of a special money advance to accrue only to those who did as Mr. Schurz wished. It also exploded the amiable fiction that the Sioux would eat up all the Poncas who went back to Dakota, and that the Interior Department was taking the only steps which could prevent an Indian war, or rather a massacre. It shows that the returned Poncas are on the best of terms with the Sioux, and that the latter fully recognized the justice of the decision made by the United States Court at Omaha, that those lands belong to the Poncas, and that they alone are capable of holding them to any other possessor. In view of these facts, the public are justified in suspecting that the Secretary of the Interior has not been acting with perfect candor in this whole matter. Can all this, that we know to be true, have been unknown to Mr. Schurz when he wrote that pathetic letter to Gov. Long? Could he have given the public a full statement of what the President's Commission telegraphed to Washington, when he told the country that the result of their inquiry confirmed his policy? Nor has Mr. Schurz strengthened the desire of his friends to believe the best about him, by his conduct since the full report came to hand. Mr. Allen, one of the four commissioners, charges him with having given to the newspapers a report of what he (Mr. Allen) had said to the Senate Committee, which is "grossly inaccurate, unfair and misleading," and intended "to prejudice public opinion in advance of official reports." The report in question certainly stands in the most glaring contradiction to what Mr. Allen had said in his Report of the Commission at his own supplement to it. We are not surprised that he did not care to be represented to the country as an idiot, whatever cost to official reputations might be involved in his denial."

The idea which seems to prevail in the Interior Department at Washington is that anything is fair in dealing with the red man. Expatriation, fraud and violence have been and are under Secretary Schurz the favorite weapons of that Department. In a few days a new administration will assume the seals of office. Do we expect too much when we hope that its policy in regard of the Indians will be, if not distinctively Christian, as it ought, at all events prove more just and enlightened than that now followed out.

HIS HANDS FULL.

President-elect Garfield has his hands full in the selection of his cabinet. From present indications it would appear that Senator Blaine holds the inside track for the secretaryship of State. The President-elect is certainly under very grave political obligations to Mr. Blaine. To the latter's withdrawal at the Chicago convention Mr. Garfield is indebted for his nomination and election. It is not then surprising that he should give the leadership of his administration to Senator Blaine. The filling of the other places will, we think, be found more difficult. Apart from the Senator from Maine, the Republican party has in its ranks two men of very wide influence and insatiable aspiration for leadership. These men are Roscoe Conkling of New York, and Simon Cameron of Pennsylvania. They dislike Blaine, and probably distrust each other. For the present their aim is to keep the claims of Gen. Grant as prominently as possible before the public to secure his election in 1884. The new administration, if guided by Blaine, will certainly shape its local influence in the various states to pre-

vent a re-nomination of Grant. It will be the manifest purpose of the other two managers to counteract the influence of the redoubtable Senator from the far North, by pressing the claims of certain of their own followers and friends for the other Cabinet offices. There must thus be a conflict between the views, interests, and aspirations of Mr. Blaine on the one hand, and those of Messrs. Conkling and Cameron on the other. It appears probable, however, that the President elect will not permit himself to become a mere tool in the hand of any politician. If he have determination enough to choose for himself and good judgment sufficient to make proper selections, the nation, irrespective of party, will approve his choice. We cannot, of course, yet say what the policy of the new Cabinet will be in regard of the many important questions likely to demand and receive its attention. With Senator Blaine as its ruling spirit we may expect to see the fisheries' question re-opened and the American side of the case handled with a dexterity and determination that will require all the tact and firmness of our own government to meet. We may also look forward to a continuance of the unfortunate policy of sectionalism—but perhaps in a modified degree—which the republican party has inherited from its progenitors. The rapid and extraordinary growth of the South in wealth and population since the war, should bring the republican leaders to a sense of justice and equanimity in dealing with that section. There is, unfortunately, no man in the Southern Republican ranks to whom a Cabinet place could be offered, of such a reputation as to command the confidence or respect of the white people of the South. Without such a man in his Cabinet, President Garfield will find it almost impossible to deal effectually and fairly with the Southern question. He will nevertheless be bound to do all he can to remove the base of discord and bitterness from the nation.

The Indian question is another that must receive a share of the attention of the incoming Cabinet. We feel assured that any change could not make matters worse than they are now under the tyrannical administration of Secretary Schurz. Why this man ever found a place in an American administration we do not know. His retirement into private life will be a boon to the poor Indians at least.

The Chinese question will, no doubt, engage the earnest reflection of the new President and his advisers. We do not, however, expect any final solution of the difficulty for some years to come.

With these and other questions of international importance to deal with, President Garfield's administration will require all the prudence, skill and foresight so necessary to the Executive Council of a great nation.

THE DIVORCE QUESTION.

The Governor of Massachusetts, in a recent message to its Legislature, deprecates the alarming increase of divorce in that State. It will certainly be a source of relief to the other States of the Union, and to the world at large, that the Puritanical zeal of Massachusetts has at length found a domestic abuse to eradicate. Massachusetts has always sorely troubled itself about the miseries and injustice visited upon other States and countries. The misgovernment of one, the ignorance of another, the peculiar institutions of a third, have been ever certain to find in Massachusetts criticism of the approved Puritanical stamp, which knows but one side of any question. We could admire the noble philanthropic spirit of a state enjoying the blessing of good government and social happiness eager to diffuse the same blessing elsewhere. But a state enjoying no better government and no greater social happiness than others, undertaking to lecture the world at large and dragon commonwealths more or less under its influence into admiration and imitation of its institutions, is an anomaly and possibly a nuisance in the political world. The Puritanism of New England is, we believe, happily for New England, and happily for the whole American Union, rapidly dying out. What is

killing this once powerful system? Nothing but its own vices. If divorce to-day has the hold we know it has on the American public mind, it is due to Puritanism. If the nameless secret crimes which decimate and degrade the American people, are daily on the increase, it is due to Puritanism. That system could ever see the mote in its neighbor's eye, but failed to take any account of the beam which blurred the moral vision of its own. In the days of slavery in the South, it was not the cry of the bruised and beaten slave, but the wail of the New England conventicle, that drew attention to the social condition of the South, then and now superior to that of many Northern States. It was New England also which gave being and strength to know-nothingism with its crimes and atrocities. Its course on the slavery question was dictated by jealousy of the South; on the exclusion of foreigners by hatred of Catholicity. We never yet heard of any complaint from Massachusetts of the injustice and oppression visited upon the poor Indians of the West, for that injustice and that oppression spring from the instincts of Puritanical intolerance. But the Massachusetts of today is not, we would fain believe, the Massachusetts of thirty or even twenty years ago. A new population, one more honest, noble minded and truly Christian is rapidly taking the place of the Puritan element. From this population the Government of the State may justly expect support in any attempt he may see fit to make to suppress divorce. The rising generation feels already the careful effects of a system of marriage laws as unchristian and debasing as that in force amongst the Mormons. We hope the young public men of Massachusetts will stop short of nothing but the abolition of this iniquitous system. By bringing about its abolition they will give their state a true and indisputable title to the gratitude of the American republic, and to the admiration of the world.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY.

On the evening of March 17th, a grand concert will be given in London in aid of the new Cathedral, Misses Reidy, of Simcoe, Cinch of St. Mary's, and a celebrated harpist from New York, have already been engaged, as well as our best local talent. Our readers may expect a concert this year equal, if not superior, to any ever before given in London.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

"The Irish expected a land bill from Mr. Gladstone, and it certainly looks preposterous to give them coercion when the country is so remarkably quiet," says a prominent English member of Parliament, Mr. Puleston.

ONE of the Irish members expelled from Parliament by brute force (they had to drag him out) is a Presbyterian minister, the Rev. Isaac Nelson. What will our Presbyterian friends now think of the mother country's parliamentary procedure. Some of them will perchance set about considering if there is not, after all, something rotten in the state of Denmark.

We have learned with great pleasure of the elevation of Bishop Charbonnel, formerly Bishop of Toronto, to the dignity of an Archbishop. This distinguished mark of the favor of the Holy See towards this venerable prelate is due to his exalted virtues and his life-long and invaluable services to the holy Church and to the salvation of souls. Our readers will be glad to hear of his promotion.

Now we know what members mean by speaking of the House of Commons' dignity. Here is a scene from a late session: Mr. Millbank to Mr. Biggar—"You're a—counsel." Mr. Biggar to Mr. Millbank—"You're a—fool." Mr. Millbank to the Speaker: "Please, sir, Biggar is calling names." And the Speaker decides that Mr. Biggar was wrong in telling the truth so loudly.

The Observer remarks that "it is the supreme duty of the Irish clergy and people to show that, even in the heat of strife in a sense of legitimate interests, the children of the Church are distinguished from the followers of revolutionary remembrance the cardinal principles of Catholic morality, that the existence of the end does not justify means