

The Catholic Record

Published every Friday morning at 42 Richmond Street.

Annual subscription..... \$2 00
Six months..... 1 00

ADVERTISING RATES.
Ten cents per line for first, and five cents per line for each subsequent insertion. Advertisements measured in nonpareil type, 12 lines to an inch.

Contract advertisements for three, six or twelve months, special terms. All advertisements should be handed in not later than Tuesday morning.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.
All matter intended for publication must have the name of the writer attached, and must reach the office not later than Tuesday noon of each week.

THOS. COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor.

LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSH.

LONDON, ENGL., May 23, 1878.
DEAR MR. COFFEY.—As you have become proprietor and publisher of the CATHOLIC RECORD, I deem it my duty to change in its ownership and its management.

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 23, 1880.

THRICE ELECTED.

The election of Mr. Parnell in three important constituencies, one of them the Metropolis of the South, is the most significant feature in the whole campaign. We ventured some weeks ago to assert that in most constituencies all that would be required of candidates on the popular side would be a certificate of approval from Mr. Parnell. Our prophecy has been fully realized. His candidates have, with very few exceptions, been triumphant. Even in Wexford, where the young Irish leader received rather rough treatment at the hands of a mob in Ennis-corthy, the two candidates enjoying his approval were elected by more than two thousand majority. Amiable and popular gentlemen like the O'Connor Don and Captain King-Harman, accused of indifference or neglect on the Land Question, were ruthlessly overthrown in the popular storm. Even Col. Colthurst holds his seat in Cork county by a majority so narrow as to make the contest there almost a victory for the Land League.

But the return of Mr. Parnell himself for three constituencies, Meath, Mayo, and Cork city, is the most striking proof of his power over the masses at this moment.

The active section of the Irish party, largely increased in numbers, enters the new Parliament with the brightest promise. With nothing less than Irish soil for Irish landholders, will that party be content, and with nothing less, we venture to say, can the contentment of the empire be secured. That statesman who gauges the intensity of feeling on this question in Ireland by the triple election of Mr. Parnell is alone capable of devising for that afflicted country an adequate system of land reform.

FINIS.

The resignation of Lord Beaconsfield has relieved the British Empire of the autocratic rule which, for six years, maintained a policy of wretched inaction at home and titillating aggression abroad. The policy of imperialism at home led to inaction in the matter of domestic legislation, at a time when the requirements of the people demanded liberal and comprehensive measures of reform. With discontent amongst the laboring classes in the great towns, and famine amongst the agriculturists of Ireland, a wise and paternal government would have found scope for the exercise of prudent but thorough measures of relief. The government seemingly preferred to leave these evils to their own cure. While distress afflicted the overcrowded towns in the manufacturing districts, and hunger spread its dark shadow over a whole nation within the Imperial realm itself, Lord Beaconsfield was deaf to the cries of distress, blind to the woe of scenes of starvation.

With empty declamation, assuring the people of peace with honor, and threatening all nations with the readiness of England to assume and to maintain ascendancy in foreign politics, he vainly sought to beguile the people. The people felt that his

first attention—that his constant solicitude—should have been directed to the alleviation of the miseries of the suffering masses at home. That, this first and most necessary duty accomplished, the government might, if any occasion justly demanded it, maintain that position of dignity and influence so long held by Britain in the councils of Europe. A policy of repressive inaction at home, and of meddlesome intervention abroad, resulted in shaking public confidence in a government which, for its whole course, foreign and domestic, could offer no explanation but mystifying grandiloquence. The case of Ireland, known months ago to be one of urgent necessity, calling for the immediate intervention of government, excited no sympathy in the breasts of rulers whose philanthropy could know nothing of famine at home while ascendancy in foreign affairs had to be maintained. Pre-occupied with schemes of territorial extension in South Africa, with secret treaties inviting the acquisition of such a valued island as Cyprus, and protectorates so necessary to English ascendancy as that of Asia Minor, with the establishment of the scientific frontier in Afghanistan, the Ministry fought Ireland.

Famine came upon that devoted land, and would certainly have carried off its victims in hundreds of thousands had not the alms of the world averted the catastrophe. As if to insult the Irish race in its misfortune, the government did, at the eleventh hour, propound a scheme of relief, authorizing the forging of new shackles in the sacred name of charity. With that profession of hypocrisy on its lips, it then made appeal to the electorate of the three kingdoms. The response of the people has been complete, crushing, overwhelming. Cruel indifference to home concerns, and offensive interference abroad have, in the recent verdict of the people of Great Britain, received a check we would fain consider final and effectual.

As a politician Lord Beaconsfield has received his death warrant. Twice has his party, under his leadership—with the prestige and influence the possession of power confers—been brought to overthrow, in each case disastrous beyond measure. The overthrow of 1868, like that of 1880, largely brought about by Irish indignation, should teach the Conservative party that the time has passed when empty denunciations of Irish patriotic aspirations and studied neglect of Irish interests can commend a government or a party to favor, sympathy or influence.

Lord Beaconsfield retires leaving in history a name unassociated with any scheme of British progress at home or solid imperial aggrandizement abroad.

ARRANT HYPOCRISY.

The French Minister of Finance is reported to have stated at a banquet at Dijon that the Cabinet, unanimously approving the anti-Jesuit decrees, would persecute nobody, respect liberty of conscience, but rigidly enforce the law. We have here three distinct declarations worthy some brief notice.

First, the Minister states that the government will persecute nobody. In the matter of persecution there are two interested parties—he who persecutes and he who is persecuted. Both are entitled to be heard. We have the Minister's words that nobody is to be persecuted. What say those whose rights are affected by the recent decrees concerning unauthorized religious orders and communities? They are to be deprived of their homes, and in some cases exiled because of their being members of such communities. Is this persecution or is it not? The Catholic body throughout France is, by the operation of these same decrees, to be deprived of the ministrations of these communities—ministrations they prize so much! The poor, the sick, the unfortunate and the ignorant are all to be robbed of the succor, the tenderness, the consolation, and the light each so much needs. Is this persecution or is it not? This persecution or is it not? The most wicked of men may associate for the furtherance of criminal objects, and the law does not reach them. They may erect palatial

homes for sin, debauchery, and dishonor. Their example may pollute the minds of youth, their influence may corrupt the well-springs of a pure and healthy social advancement. Yet we hear of no laws being enforced to arrest their criminality or remove its baneful effects. It may, however, be said, and we believe it is affirmed, that the societies about to be suppressed by the French Government, are inimical to its existence. In public affairs it is the recognized right of all citizens to think as their judgment may guide them of the course pursued by politicians. The equality of all in the eye of the law in this respect is the boast of every free country. In monarchical Britain and republican America—countries which, without being in all things guided by the maxim of religion, are in the main governed by principles consistent with religious and true freedom—no one in these countries questions the right of every individual citizen to hold and, if he thinks fit, express his views on any topic of public interest. In republican France it is otherwise. That country seems decided on making the nearest possible approach to that impossibility—a State without a God. Its efforts in this direction, to deny a right to citizens convicted of no crime, while it harbors foreign conspirators bent on assassination, proves its utter want of respect for honor and truth, not to speak of religion at all. But where the absurdity of the action of the Government is apparent is in this fact—which the most violent of the revolutionary party cannot prove—that the religious body, either collectively or individually, do not interfere in politics. How can they then be inimical to the Government? Numbers of religious houses do not even receive the newspapers, the time of the inmates being occupied solely by religious, devotional, or charitable exercises. Those engaged in the work of education do not in any way infringe on the right of the State, unless, indeed, instruction based on law, morality and the Gospel, as opposed to disorder, licentiousness, and godlessness, constitute an interference with the functions of a State having the three latter attributes for its pride and boast. Aye, this is the State that will persecute nobody. It deprives the poor and the infirm of succor and sympathy, robs the Church of the ministrations of her devoted religious communities, invades the sacred precincts of the domain of conscience, assaults Christianity, mocks its founder and degrades the French race. Yet it does not and will not persecute!

The second assertion of the minister, that the Administration will respect the liberty of conscience, is simply an insulting perversion of truth. Respect the liberty of conscience and deny Catholics the rights of religious education! Respect the freedom of conscience and close the religious institutions of the country! Respect the freedom of conscience and banish the Jesuits, while taking to heart the Nihilist assassins! Respect the freedom of conscience and insult religion, deride its practices, curtail its freedom!

The third assertion of the minister, that the Government will enforce the laws, may be taken for what it is worth, and that is very little indeed. The Government should, we admit, be guided by a determination to enforce just laws, but in this particular case the government is supposed to be determined to enforce the laws for the suppression of the religious institutions. The Administration of the day will, if supported by the radicalism now predominant in French politics, stop at nothing in the way of impiety. But it may be that the radicals are sighing for the spoils of office, and feel themselves able, if called to free, to do alone that which M. de Freycinet now seeks their support to do. To their credit it must be said, that when they resolve upon the destruction of any monument of religion they make no apology, indulge in no arrant hypocrisy such as did the Minister of Finance in the recent banquet at Dijon. They are a curse to society, a plague to mankind, but not more so than the canting knaves who

prate of liberty and conscience, while undermining the one and overhauling the other.

THE COMING STORM.

M. Clemenceau, leader of the radical element in the French Chamber of Deputies, recently addressed an immense and enthusiastic meeting of his constituents, denouncing the whole policy of the government. After all its efforts to promote "reform," the DeFreycinet Cabinet has failed to impress M. Clemenceau favorably.

The Government has indeed made it a matter of constant study to enlist in its own favor the radical element in and out of the Chamber. With the support of M. Gambetta, seated high on the presidential chair of the Chamber of Deputies, they, no doubt, imagined themselves secure in revolutionary favor. M. Clemenceau has long since thrown off the yoke of Gambetta, and is evidently supported by those who elected him. His policy is a policy of rapid and complete destruction. For laws, customs, or institutions standing in the way of his aggressive policy, he holds and professes no other respect than that animating the wolf towards the lamb in the path.

The communistic element has evidently acquired such power in France that neither the cowardice of M. DeFreycinet, the hypocrisy of M. Gambetta, the impiety of M. Ferry, nor the poltroonery of Prince Jerome Napoleon, can produce the slightest effect on the tide that is now rolling in to engulf the so-called republic.

French republicanism must evidently be radical or nothing. The present Cabinet are anxious at this moment to quarrel with the religious bodies. They will soon have a more terrible foe to encounter. French communism is, without the least doubt, preparing for another onslaught on order and internal peace. The struggle will be fierce. The very enthusiasm which lately greeted M. Clemenceau shows that the approaching storm will be one of the severest that has yet visited France and Europe.

"ROMANISM IN NEW YORK."

The *Christian Guardian* seeks to revive a cry long since exploded through the practical good sense of our American neighbors. By craftily-arranged extracts from the brochure of a frenzied papaphobist, it seeks to impress on its readers' minds the enormity of Catholic misrule in New York in the matter of relief to public charities.

The object of the *Guardian* in going to New York for a grievance is without doubt to warn its readers against ever permitting, in so far as in them it may lie, any such domination as it deplors in New York. The *Guardian* observes a sort of melancholy truthfulness on all subjects except religion in general, and Catholicity in particular. Where there is untruth there is injustice, and as the *Guardian* could not observe the dictates of truth in reviving an insane cry raised by Yankee ward politicians, it could not but be guilty of gross injustice to the Catholic institutions of that city. Though many of these institutions do the work of charity in a manner challenging the admiration of the American public, fulfilling objects which no secular or sectarian institutions have ever attained, or will ever attain—though their sphere of usefulness, in the doing of the noblest deeds of mercy, is indeed more heavenly than human—they are denounced by demagogues and by scribes, who live on the husks that fatten popular prejudice and nurture popular hate. Now, what are the facts concerning institutions in the city of New York receiving city or state assistance? From an exact statement of sums contributed to all such institutions in the city of New York by city and by state for thirty-one years—from January, 1847, to January, 1878, the total number of Protestant and non-Catholic institutions for public charity receiving such aid is found to be one hundred and twenty-seven, and of Catholic institutions so aided twenty.

We challenge the *Guardian* to question the following statements: That all Catholic institutions in New York receiving public assistance are devoted to the relief of persons whose destitution, helplessness, and misery would, if not thus relieved, make them a burden on the taxpayers of the city or state. That several of the non-Catholic charities are not devoted to the relief of persons of this class, and therefore have no claim on the public chest. That many of the non-Catholic institutions are vehicles of proselytism. That the assistance granted by city and state treasuries to these sectarian institutions has been out of proportion large to the work they

do, or, in comparison with the aid given Catholic institutions of a corresponding class. The *Guardian* makes some indecent references to the Foundling Asylum of the Sisters of Charity, which will no doubt bear repetition on many a camp meeting field in the coming season. For the information of our good friend, we have to inform him that besides the Foundling Asylum of the Sisters of Charity, doing a work of charity acknowledged by the whole secular press of New York—with possibly one exception—there is an Infant Asylum with a similar object in view, but under Protestant control, and that these Asylums are both under the supervision of the same State officers and authorities.

We do not desire to impugn the usefulness of the latter institution, but we claim that if any of the charges made by the fanatical author of the brochure which the *Guardian* so flatteringly notices, were capable of verification, the founding asylum of the sisters would long since have been struck off the list of State charities.

The *Guardian's* covert appeal to the smouldering bigotry of Canadian sectaries is a proof of the means to which the journals devoted to fanaticism must stoop to retain support.

REFLECTIONS ON GOVERNMENT AND THE DUTIES OF CITIZENS.

We resume to-day the consideration of the subject to which we called the attention of our readers on the 27th ult. On that day we concluded with a recital of the various powers and faculties with which government is invested. We had, previous to this recital, established the principle that government is necessary to society. Without it, indeed, society should crumble to pieces, and man lapse into a state of utter barbarism. But society, being of divine origin, man being, by his constitution, wants, and aspirations an essentially social being, society is never left without government of some kind. The purpose of man's creation being to love and serve God in this world, the kind Providence of God has never left, and never will leave, man in such a state, that he should by the loss of all that enables him to live as man—understanding, language, and sense of dignity—efface from his soul that image and likeness of his Creator to which he is made.

From the considerations into which we have already entered, we may deduce three conclusions:—1st. Society is necessary to man, and of divine institution. 2nd. Government is necessary to society, and of divine right, in so far as it represents that principle of authority without which society cannot subsist. 3rd. Government is invested with the rights and functions to claim obedience from all who enjoy its protection. From the nature of these rights and functions, we may apprehend government as meaning the power to frame legislation, execute just laws, administer justice in case of disputes, and mete out punishment to lawless men. Government is of various kinds. It is *theocratic, monarchical, aristocratic and republican*.

A *theocratic* government is one administered through divine interposition. This interposition may be immediate or mediate. The case of the Hebrew race in Egypt and in the desert affords an example of the former—the condition of the same people, under the judges, of the latter. Under this form we may make allusion to the system of spurious theocracy built upon fraud and imposition, established in various countries, by the followers of Mahomet, and the more ancient but not less iniquitous and baneful systems in vogue in many other oriental nations, especially Hindostan. These systems are purely despotic monarchies, but are so interwoven with the religious practices, belief and observances of the people who live under their operation, as to present an outward form of theocracy, demonstrating the truth of the saying, *corruptio optima pessima*, by showing how a system of gross abuse, under the shape of the highest and safest form of government, can degrade and enslave whole nations. The *monarchical* form of government is of two kinds, *absolute*, and *limited*, or *constitutional*. Under the former system the laws proceed from, and are executed by the sovereign will of the monarch. He may be advised by his courtiers or by persons specially appointed for that

purpose. His ministers may, and, in fact, do very often exercise control over his actions, but cannot in any case, save that of successful revolt, enforce their will against the choice and purpose of their sovereign. Limited or constitutional monarchies are those wherein the sovereign is assisted in the framing and executing of the laws by some council or assembly not named, appointed or elected by himself, which may also prevent his overstepping his power and refuse assent to his proposals, even when made within his legitimate authority. Monarchies are either elective or hereditary. Of the former, the most notable example is that of the Papacy. The Empire of Germany, the kingdom of Poland, and the ancient kingdom of Ireland, were also elective. The monarchies of Europe are at present all hereditary. Many of them are absolute, even of those with the forms of a constitutional system. For the enlightenment of that class, unfortunately too numerous in our time and country, which holds the Catholic church to be in antagonism with liberty and human advancement, we may remark that in Catholic times all the monarchies of Europe were constitutional, but in many instances lost their constitutional complexion with the advent of Protestantism. The old French and Spanish monarchies, the kingdoms of England, Scotland, Ireland, Hungary, Denmark and Poland were all constitutional monarchies, but with the advent of religious commotions in the sixteenth century the reigning monarchs seized the occasion, in some cases to abridge, in others to abolish, the forms of constitutional government. In the case of England, although the monarchs of the Houses of Tudor and Stuart were as absolute as the Czar or the Sultan are to-day, the forms of constitutional and parliamentary government were fortunately preserved.

The *autocratic* form of government is that wherein the governing power is vested in a number of persons of exalted rank, station, dignity, learning and wealth, who choose from amongst themselves one or more persons to administer the government. In Venice, Genoa, Florence, and other Italian commonwealths, this form of government prevailed. The Chief Magistrate in these States was so fettered by restrictions devised by the nobility, in order to ensure the permanency of their own influence, that very little was left to his initiative, either in the way of legislation or administration. Any attempt at enlarging his powers gave rise to severe conflicts, in which rival families, regardless of the interests of the commonwealth, fought for the supremacy of their own houses or factions. These intestine conflicts being of frequent recurrence, led to the decadence of the States governed under this system.

The *republican* or *democratic* form of government is that wherein the people at large, through persons chosen, either directly or indirectly by themselves for a limited period, devise and execute the laws of the State. When we say the people, we do not mean that all who reside within the State are entitled to the rights of citizenship. There are in every State, and there should be especially in a republic, certain qualifications required in those who desire to enjoy the privileges of citizenship. In a well-regulated republic and in constitutional monarchies, those who discharge the functions of citizenship should be men of tried virtue and patriotism, for on them devolves the same duties which in other countries monarchs themselves are called on to exercise. While all should enjoy the protection of the laws, the privileges of citizenship should be restricted to those who, by property, rank, education and virtue, are best qualified to discharge its duties with benefit to the State and to society at large. The republican form of government prevails in the United States of America, in France, Switzerland and other countries. We do not include Mexico or the South American so-called republics, which, with perhaps one exception, are not republics, but anarchical despotisms dignified by the name of republics.

The United States and Switzerland are federal republics, each consisting