

The Catholic Record

Published every Friday morning at 466 Richmond Street, THOS. COFFEY, Proprietor.

Annual subscription \$1.00 Six months 50c

LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSH

London, Oct. 21, 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 one and principle, 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.

Believe me, Yours very sincerely, THOS. COFFEY, Editor.

Mr. THOMAS COFFEY, Office of the "Catholic Record."

LETTER FROM MR. POWER

The following letter was given to our agent in Halifax by Mr. Power, administrator of the Archdiocese of Halifax.

St. Mary's, Halifax, N. S., June 30, 1882. DEAR MR. WALSH:—It is with pleasure that I give my approval to the work in which you are engaged as I have always considered the "Record" to be a valuable and truly Catholic paper, deserving of every encouragement and support.

I am, sincerely yours, PATRICK MOR, POWER, Administrator.

FROM HIS GRACE ARCHBISHOP HANNAN

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.

MICHAEL HANNAN, Archbishop of Halifax.

Catholic Record

LONDON, FRIDAY, AUG. 18, 1882.

TRUE INWARDNESS.

At a recent meeting of the London Board of Education, there was made a display of stupid fanaticism of which we thought most, if not all our public bodies were now free. We had, it is true, often heard it stated, that by some anomaly passing strange, it does frequently happen that Boards of Education are composed of men of little ability and towering ignorance. We can hardly believe that our city Public School Board is of such a character. There is no doubt, however, that a certain percentage of its members represent a market over-stocked with that shameful bigotry, the progeny of offensive indecency and rankest ignorance. On the 8th of August last, at a meeting of the Public School Board of London, question arose as to the appointment of teachers to fill certain vacancies. Amongst the applicants was Miss O'Donohue, a Catholic young lady, who has all the qualifications required by law to hold position as a Public School teacher. The law does not lay it down as a qualification that candidates for such places should not be of the Catholic faith. Certain members of the London School Board are, however, wiser than law or legislature. What neither the one prescribes or the other could ordain, these men of overpowering brainlessness would fain enforce. From the report of the proceedings we learn that when one member proposed Miss O'Donohue for a vacancy, no fewer than three others objected on the ground that she was a Roman Catholic, and one in particular, a Mr. Wilson, who evidently deserves to hold high place on the black roll of unreasoning fanaticism, declared that he would not like to see a "Hindoo brought here from India to teach Christianity. It was a similar case," Mr. Wilson clearly thought he was saying something exceedingly clever when he made this declaration. It may, indeed, have been clever enough for him, for judging from his public utterances, few would dare impeach him with the crime of knowing that Hindoos come from India. His knowledge, however, does it appears, extend even that far, for which the Public School supporters of London should be very grateful. Now for the enlightenment of Mr. Wilson, if a man who knows just exactly where Hindoos come from needs enlightenment, we desire to say that there are Hindoos quite as estimable as many so-called Christians; that Hindoos, if otherwise qualified according to law, could not be legally excluded on account of their religious belief from holding the position of Public School teacher.

We may also inform Mr. Wilson

that there is no provision in the school law of Ontario making the teaching of Christianity obligatory in the public schools; that there are many supporters of these schools who are avowed infidels and many more practically so. The assertion made by another member of the School Board that the application of a Catholic candidate for the position of teacher should be rejected because there are Catholic Separate Schools established in this city, proceeds from the assumption which the most zealous advocates of secular education have always repudiated, that the Public School system is Protestant, or to say the least non-Catholic. These schools are, according to their most enlightened advocates, open to all. The law itself declares it, and the establishment of Separate Schools anywhere does not prevent Catholics who desire to do so from supporting the Public Schools, and having their children entered in the same. We may also remind Mr. Wilson and his associates in the government of the local public schools that Catholics are contributors to the Provincial funds from which the public schools draw a large portion of their support, and that the Separate Schools of Ontario do not receive that quota of governmental and municipal aid to which they are entitled. Unless the public school system of the Province be legally declared Protestant or anti-Christian, Catholics have as good a right as others to apply for any position created by its operation. Is Mr. Wilson prepared to have the law take any such shape in the exclusion of Catholics, or would he be content with the sole exclusion of Hindoos? We shall be glad to hear from him. His ignorant splutter at the late meeting of the board will, however, have the good effect of showing to the public the true inwardness of himself and others entrusted with the administration of school affairs in this city. We may also add that objections such as those raised at that meeting to the employment of Catholic preceptors under the Public School system should teach the Catholics of Ontario to put true value on the Separate School system and seek to perfect it as far as possible.

CAUSE AND EFFECT

Many Canadian journalists—some through antipathy for Ireland and for the religion of the majority of its people—give prominence to telegraphic reports of "outrages" from that country. We are not disposed to deny that many unfortunate crimes have occurred in Ireland within the past three years; but we deny that the crimes of the few are chargeable to the many, and that the Irish race as a whole is free from the imputation of complicity in these sad affairs. Many of these crimes have been greatly exaggerated. Others have been manufactured out of whole cloth, and not a few "outrages" have been concocted by landlords themselves to excite sympathy for them abroad, especially in Britain.

We desire to be understood when we declare that outrage in any shape, whether it takes the form of intimidation, assault, mutilation, or assassination, is not, and cannot be under any circumstances justifiable. We also hold that secret combinations of any sort, formed even for the attainment of ostensibly good objects, are perilous in themselves, subversive of Christian order and morality, and strongly to be condemned. But while holding these views, and clearly expressing them, we desire also to state that agrarian crime in Ireland is due almost wholly to the injustice of the land tenure system obtaining in that country, and that the secret political associations which are supposed to exist in the interests of the land agitation, but of whose existence we have had as yet no proof, must, if they really have existence, be the offspring of landlord cruelty and governmental tyranny. Much ado is daily and weekly made here through the instrumentality of the press concerning reported outrages in Ireland. Our readers, knowing that the whistling or singing of popular airs, the walking along of country roads after dark and the throwing of a stone, however accidental, are considered agrarian out-

rages in Ireland do not feel surprised when the monthly total of these outrages, as computed from English sources, reaches very a high figure. There are, however, many who evidently attach belief to the figures published through governmental inspiration. To these, and to all others ignorant of the true state of Ireland, we would say, that an acquaintance, however limited, with the history of that country would serve to disabuse their minds of prejudice, and lead them to a comprehension of the real causes of Irish discontent. We do not now seek to disinter the dead past. We desire to refer to two periods of Irish history still modern. Events connected with these times still contribute to make the Irish question in its more recent phases one of the living questions of the day and the hour. Let those who are surprised at the discontent prevailing in Ireland cast their eyes back to the times immediately anterior to the Union—not yet one hundred years. What will they find? Catholic Ireland constituting fully four-fifths of the entire people—though deprived of political freedom—outraged, persecuted, and even threatened with extermination, and this infamy practised with the object of driving the whole nation into anarchy and revolt. Never, indeed, was a country persecuted as was Ireland, at this dreadful time. Lord Gosford, himself a Protestant, describes the persecution as it existed in 1795-6. "Neither age, nor even acknowledged innocence can excite mercy. The only crime which the wretched objects are charged with is the profession of the Roman Catholic faith. A lawless banditti have constituted themselves judges of this new delinquency, and the sentence they pronounce is equally concise and terrible: it is nothing less than confiscation of property and immediate banishment. It would be painful to detail the horrors of this proscription—a proscription that exceeds, in the number of its victims, every example of ancient and modern history."

Dr. Dickson, Protestant bishop of Down, a contemporary of Lord Gosford, certified that he had seen families returning peacefully from Mass, "assailed without provocation by drunken troops and manny, and the wives and daughters exposed to every species of indignity, brutality and outrages, from which neither his remonstrances, nor those of other Protestant gentlemen, could rescue them."

Plowden, in his History of Ireland, states that in the beginning of 1796 "it was generally believed that 7,000 Catholics had been forced or burned out of the County of Armagh, and that the ferocious banditti who had expelled them had been encouraged, connived at, and protected by the government."

Mr. O'Neil Daunt, speaking of the attitude then assumed by the government towards the people, says: "The government had a direct interest in their sufferings and turbulence. Where were the people to look for the removal of their grievances? They were absolutely driven to their own rude, undisciplined, and ineffective warfare. The blazing cottage, the tortured peasant, the violated wife or daughter, the familiar outrages on the victims, literally left them no alternative but rebellion." This was written of days previous to the rebellion of 1798. May not the same be written with equal justice of the days that follow the enforcement of the repression act of 1881? Let us now come to the days of the famine of 1846-7. "The potato blight was, indeed," says the same writer, "the visitation of Providence; but the monstrous drain of Irish wealth, which deprived the people of a reserve to fall back upon, was the visitation of England. The drain of absentee rents averaged at £3,000,000 annually for the forty-six years the Union had then lasted, reached £138,000,000 sterling. If we average at £1,000,000 stg. per annum the Irish taxes exported from Ireland during the same period, the combined drain will reach £184,000,000. It is impossible to calculate with accuracy the amount of actual cash sent out of the country to purchase articles of English manufacture, which, after the Union, supplanted our own. If we average the drain

on this head at £1,000,000 per annum, the total loss on these three heads must have amounted in 1846 to £230,000,000. Now if we apply the same mode of reckoning to the entire eighty-two years the Union may now be said to have lasted, we will find Ireland's total loss by that measure to have been £460,000,000 stg., a figure truly appalling for a poor and misgoverned country. Can any one wonder in the face of these facts and figures that Ireland is discontented, that her exiled sons the world over are filled with indignation in contemplating the causes that have led to embitterment and national ruin? Let those who now express superabundant horror at reported outrages from Ireland, study the history of that unfortunate country and there they will find imprinted in boldest character the cause of the present disturbed state of that country.

A MODEL CORRESPONDENT.

For absolute belief not only in personal but national infallibility and impeccability, commend us to the average Englishman. To that something called the "British Constitution," of which he generally knows little, but, as it is supposed to be English, he gives a sort of worship that he desires to impose on all others coming in contact with him. In other words, he has an idol, and that is himself. It is not with any special feeling of gratification that we point out this defect in English character. It is well known and acknowledged everywhere the Englishman is known. Now, the time when the English idea of brute force, with sometimes little else but Irish valor to sustain it, can prevail in this world of woe, has passed away and forever. An Anglo-Saxon of the loud-mouthed, brute force character is evidently the London correspondent of the Globe. By the way, the Globe, unfortunately the organ of an unfortunate party, for whose misfortunes it is at least partially responsible, appears to be bound by some sort of charm to choose correspondents who make themselves and that journal odious to large bodies of the Canadian public. The special commissioner who, through heroic devotedness to public morality, some time ago attacked the character of the virtuous female industrial operatives of Canada, is a fair specimen of this class of writers. The London correspondent of the Globe is another, as shown by his views on the action of the Canadian Parliament in regard of Irish grievances. He says: "There is a good deal of talk here about the address presented to Lord Kimberly on behalf of the Queen from the Dominion Parliament. As you will have heard by telegraph the thundering of the Times, I need not here repeat any of the anathemas which appeared yesterday in leader type. You may, however, like to know that there is but one opinion here, and that is that the address was extremely ill-advised, ill-timed, and unfortunate. As regards the question of Home Rule, there is not the slightest resemblance between Ireland and the Dominion. The Irish people, divided among themselves, animated by the fiercest religious animosity, an excitable, emotional race, always liable to be worked upon by mischievous demagogues, cannot for one moment be compared with the quiet French habitants or the law-abiding, loyal people of Ontario. What Ireland might be were it not for an ignorant priesthood and professional agitators it is impossible to say; but were Home Rule conceded to that unhappy country nothing is more certain than that civil war, anarchy and the oppression of minorities—not to speak of rebellion—would be the almost immediate consequences. Not even for a party cry, or to win the Irish vote in places where it is powerful, would any sane English politician put up on the Home Rule cry. On the other hand I have no doubt that were Mr. Gladstone's hands free he would, and probably intends to, frame a beneficial measure which will give the Irish people very much greater powers in local government. More than this can neither be expected nor conceded. I do not altogether like the tone of the leading article in the Times, but the general drift of the writer echoes, I am bound to say, the feeling here on the subject."

The writer whose opinions the Globe does not disavow assumes that the Irish people cannot "for a moment" be compared with the quiet French habitants or the law-

abiding loyal people of Ontario. He also speaks of the priesthood of Ireland as ignorant, and predicates civil war as a certain adjunct of Home Rule. Wonderful scribe! Enlightened specimen of Anglo-Saxon fair play! Permit us, Sir, to inform you that the Irish can be favorably compared with any race either in Europe or America. The French Canadian habitant, for whom you now express such admiration, but would crush as you have attempted to crush the Irish, is guided by a priesthood not ignorant but as enlightened and virtuous as is the priesthood of Ireland, and that one of his aptitudes for self-government is that he is so guided. Permit us also to inform you that one million of the people of Ontario, law abiding and loyal as you call them, are of Irish origin, and that the Province of Ontario, developed and improved by Irish talent and Irish industry, is to-day the wealthiest, most populous and most progressive in the Dominion of Canada, as the Globe itself will be glad to testify.

You tell us, Sir Correspondent, that the Irish are not fit for Home Rule, and yet in the very same breath inform us that Mr. Gladstone may give them some measure of local government. We ask in all calmness what is the difference between Home Rule and local self-government? The senselessly bitter effusion of the Globe's London correspondent serves to prove one thing and that is, that the address from the Parliament of Canada was one of the rudest shocks ever yet given the fabric of English misgovernment in Ireland.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The German government is at length taking the very wisest measures to enlist the confidence of the profoundly religious populations of Alsace and Lorraine. We learn from these Provinces that the Superior Council of Public instruction there has addressed a very important circular to teachers under its control, on the subject of religious education. The Council is evidently deeply impressed with the necessity of religious training forming part of the educational system supported by the state, for though attendance at divine worship is not made obligatory on the children, the teachers are instructed to influence by moral teaching and sound example the youth under their charge to assist at divine services. This circular is in good keeping with the programme of primary education for the same Provinces issued a year ago under the authority of Gen Manteuffel. This programme prescribed not only religious training of a general character, but required that the children should be taught the meaning of the various offices and festivals of religion. These wise and laudable measures taken by the German authorities in Alsace and Lorraine, stand in marked contrast with the impious recklessness of the French government and legislature.

At the late general elections no fewer than eight members of the Ontario Legislature resigned their seats to contest constituencies for the Commons. All were successful but Messrs. Murray of North Renfrew and Miller of Muskoka. Of the successful candidates three were liberal and three conservatives. Nominations have been made by both parties for most of the vacant constituencies, and in some of them the contests will be very keen. Rumor now, however, has it that there will be no special elections held, as a dissolution of Parliament is imminent. We are not aware that there is any good ground for this rumor, and are inclined to think that another session of the Legislature will be held before a general election takes place.

One of the most distressing effects of Arabi Bey's revolt against European intervention in Egypt has been to arouse the ever strong but sometimes latent feelings of hostility burning in the Mussulman breast against Christian people. Throughout Northern Africa especially since the French invasion of Tunis the Moslem populations have been very ill-disposed towards Christians. Arabi's decisive course has given an

impetus to this feeling which the brutal massacres in Alexandria and other Egyptian towns have not appeased. Europeans have begun to leave Tripoli dreading a rising of the Mahometan fanatics there. Any such rising could but lead to further European intervention. The French government would, no doubt, view with satisfaction an opportunity such as this eventuality would present of finally annexing Tunis to its African dominions. Spain would also doubtless assert its right to a foothold in Morocco and Italy in Tripoli. On the whole, Northern Africa promises to become again the theatre of the most important events to decide perhaps for centuries the destinies of some of the greatest nations of Europe.

The new French Cabinet is headed by M. Duclere. He has succeeded by the formation of a ministry in accomplishing a task which other public men with stronger legislative backing could not have attempted. His ministry, however, does not give promise of long life. It contains no man of really pre-eminent talent, and ascertained popular influence. As far as the interests of religion are concerned it is certainly no improvement on its predecessor. Of the new Premier we learn that he was born at Bagneres-de-Bigorre on November 9, 1812, and became in 1836 a proof-reader on the journal Le Bon Sens at Paris. He soon became an editor of that paper, then of the Revue du Progres and of the National from 1840 to 1846, treating economical and financial questions with great skill, and writing for M. Pagnerre's "Political Dictionary." Appointed by the revolution of 1848 assistant to Garnier-Pages in the functions of Mayor of Paris, he organized the municipality, and reformed the police on the London model. Becoming Sub-Secretary of Finance, under Garnier-Pages, he soon succeeded him as Minister. He was next chosen Deputy for the Landes in the Constituent Assembly, voted with the Left, and exposed his life during the insurrection of May and June in the effort to effect a compromise between the armed populace and the Assembly. After the suppression of that movement he struggled courageously, but vainly, against legislative measures of repression, and resigned his portfolio in protest, resuming his seat in the Chamber. Retiring from political life at the close of 1848, he became administrator of the Spanish enterprise for the canalization of the river Ebro and director of the Spanish Credit Mobilier. During the Second Empire he refused all political proposals. He was made by the Government of National Defence in December, 1870, chairman of the Committee of Inspection of Ministerial Accounts; was chosen Deputy for Basses-Pyrenees in February, 1871; became President of the Republican Left and Vice-President of the Assembly in March, 1875, and was chosen a life Senator on December 10, 1875.

There is at this moment a strong war feeling prevailing in Russia. The Russian people of all classes are well known to long for a favorable time to drive the Turks across the Bosphorus, and plant the Russian standard on the towers of Stamboul. To many of them that favorable time now appears to have come. The Turkish government, having incurred the hostility of its old protector, Britain, could hardly in case of war with Russia, look for assistance from that power. Germany and Austria would of course view with displeasure a sudden aggrandizement of Russian power through the obliteration of Turkey from the map of Europe. But Russian diplomacy might, by tempting offers of a portion of the spoils, secure the non-intervention of these powers, while its armies pushed their way to Constantinople. The Czar also might find it in his personal interest to yield to the strong war feeling now existing in Russia. If he yields to it a fierce struggle may be anticipated, for Turkey will fight to the bitter end before abandoning its possessions in Europe.

The very worst predictions of the Irish party in regard to the workings of the Repression Act are being