

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 64 and 66 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. HORTGRAVE, Editor.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, Business Manager.

THOMAS COFFEY, Proprietor.

Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto, and recommended by the Bishops of St. Boniface, Ottawa, Kingston, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and the leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Advertisements must be paid in full before the copy is sent.

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Sept. 20th, 1890.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON.

The consecration of the Right Rev. Dr. O'Connor as Bishop of London will take place in St. Peter's Cathedral in this city on Sunday, 19th of October. The day will be a most important one in the annals of the Diocese, and we feel assured the prayers of the people will ascend to the Most High that every blessing may attend the administration of the distinguished Bishop who is to be the chief shepherd of the Church in this Western part of the Province.

A JUDICIAL OUTRAGE.

We are sensitive and sympathizing people sometimes, certainly. We are shocked when we hear of Kurdish atrocities in Armenia, and knowing that such are committed at, if not positively encouraged, by the Turkish government, we are filled with indignation against Turkish rule. When we hear that exiles sent to Siberia are murdered in cold blood by officials and that the Jews of Russia are at a moment's warning driven out of the country by cruel and oppressive laws, and under circumstances which entail upon them great suffering, we are filled with indignation against Russian despotism. But when we hear that in Ireland, in the name of law and order, the houses, which poverty-stricken tenants have built for themselves, are ruthlessly destroyed by policemen, acting under direct orders from the authorities, because they do not pay excessive rents—rents imposed on their own improvements—many amongst us take it as a matter of course. It seems to make a great difference whether the acts of oppression are perpetrated by our own or by foreign governments. In the latter case no denunciation of the oppressor is too strong: in the former, many amongst us are very much inclined to think that oppression is quite justifiable.

We gave an account some months ago of the harsh treatment to which the tenants at Clongoree, Ireland, were subjected. They were required to pay such rack rents as are so commonly imposed upon the Irish tenantry, and these rack rents were for the houses they had themselves built, and for improvements which they had made in bringing bog land into a state fit for cultivation. They offered to pay all they were really able to give, and so liberal was their offer that County Judge Darley declared that it was a fair offer, and begged the landlord and his agent to accept it. They would not do so, however, and decrees of eviction were granted and put into execution. Not satisfied with turning out the unfortunate tenants, the emergency men, who, with the police, put the decrees into operation, poured petroleum upon the houses and burned them to the ground lest there should be any shelter left after their departure for those who had been turned out of their homes.

One old lady, Mrs. Kelly, seventy-five years of age, was able to pay the rent demanded, and so escaped the horrors of eviction. Her outburst, which she had herself erected, were at her own expense put into a condition to make them available as a shelter for those of the tenants whose condition was most pitiable.

Hereupon the landlord was very much provoked. The workmen were attacked many times by the police, and some of them were very seriously injured. Father Kinsella, the parish priest, along with fourteen of the workmen, were condemned to prison by the magistrate for interesting themselves in making the wretched peasantry as comfortable as possible under the circumstances.

The case was appealed and there was an investigation into the circumstances, the result of which was that the conduct of the police was declared to be illegal. No punishment, however, was inflicted upon them; and the rack-renting landlord went to work in another fashion to effect his purpose. He applied to the county judge for an injunction authorizing him to tear down the out-houses in which the tenantry were sheltered, on the ground that their presence was an injury to his property.

The judge granted the injunction, but Mrs. Kelly refused to comply with it, insisting that she had the right to give shelter on property for which she had paid the rental. Thereupon the judge, who was the same Judge Darley mentioned above, gave the extraordinary order, not only for Mrs. Kelly's arrest, but also for the arrest of her niece, Mrs. Morrissey, Mrs. Morrissey's husband, and their child, an infant seven days old; and all were immured in prison.

Owing to the sickness of the old lady and the child, the authorities reluctantly released Mrs. Kelly, Mrs. Morrissey and her infant, but Mr. Morrissey is still in prison, the period of his confinement being now over six months; though he certainly has no power to compel his wife's aunt to pull down the huts, even if he wished her to do so.

The Judge also directed the sheriff to pull down the huts, but the Court of Queen's Bench has reversed this order, declaring that the Judge exceeded his power in granting it. But the higher Court, it seems, has no authority to release Mr. Morrissey.

Application was made to the County Judge for Mr. Morrissey's release, but the Crown Counsel opposed this, and the same Judge who gave the original order for his arrest has directed that Mr. Morrissey shall remain in prison until the huts are pulled down by Mrs. Kelly.

It is surely time that there were new laws for Ireland, when such atrocities can be inflicted under the laws as they stand at present. There can be no more cogent reason for Home Rule than this outrage upon humanity, which is scarcely surpassed by the outrages perpetrated under the despotisms of the Czar and the Turkish Sultan.

THE MAIL ANGERED.

The comments of the Toronto Mail on a few amusing incidents of the C. M. B. A. banquet at Montreal are in keeping with the usual bitterness and unmanly effusions which for years have disgraced its columns. It is compelled to admit the immense benefit to Catholics of a society so philanthropic in its aims and provisions; although, through ignorance of its rules, it limits the beneficent operations of the C. M. B. A. to the sick and suffering, whereas the Catholic Mutual Benefit Society goes a step further, and reaches out its hand to the dispensing of favors and blessings even after death. The Toronto Mail has no fault to find with Catholics for being members of so admirable an association, but it attempts to throw ridicule upon them for doing what it is permitted every other society in the world to do, viz., to close the sessions of an important convention with a friendly banquet, at which songs are sung and speeches made characteristic of convivial gatherings. The Mail is particularly severe on Rev. Father Flannery for having said in his speech:

"That the Catholics of this country turn to Montreal as the Mohammedans to Mecca, and all true Christians to Rome, and they came to this great city, the protectress of Catholics, from the land of bigotry, fanaticism and Equal Rights. The Province of Quebec is the bulwark of Christianity in America, and as long as the French Canadian race is true to itself, its faith and its history, so long will the Catholic Church predominate in America."

The word "predominate" was not once mentioned in Father Flannery's speech, but the Mail must exaggerate, minimize, or misrepresent, in order to work out its detestable plan of rendering every man and everything Catholic odious in the eyes of Protestants. In further efforts at misrepresentation the Mail refers to the little ditty sung and which the reporter is obliged to admit "called forth laughter and applause." The ditty, which is now well known and sung all over the Dominion, is entitled the "Devil's Thirteen." The Mail seems to have never heard of the existence of such a ballad, although it once quoted and criticized a French translation of the same. As everybody knows such a ballad had never existed or been thought of were it not for the insane bigotry displayed uncessantly for years in the columns of the Toronto Mail. It was the heated and blood-curdling appeals of that journal which roused the fanatics of Ontario to agitate against the provisions of the Jesuits' Estate Act. It was in obedience to its unhallowed inspirations that the Wilds, Johnstons and Hunters of Ontario made rostrums of their pulpits and playhouses of their churches in vain efforts to organize a persecution and create a civil war. When the famous "Thirteen" were driven by such appeals to vote against religion, right and justice, the Mail sounded high their apothecaries and held them up to the admiration of all bigots. It could never tire in its laudations of the baker's dozen, who, in Canada, are either the slaves of fanaticism or the dupes of its own destructive policy of setting race against race and creed against creed. Next to erecting thirteen statues in honor of those slavish followers the Mail could not have gone further than it has done in striking off a pewter medal as a perpetual memorial of what is styled in every second paragraph of its columns, "the noble thirteen." It was merely with a view

to offset this fulsome flattery of weak men, and to show how utterly ludicrous the Mail appeared in making saints and heroes of them, that the ballad entitled the "Devil's Thirteen" was composed, and is now sung with much gusto everywhere. No wonder the Toronto Mail should feel wrath and exhaust its resources of acerbity and sarcasm in criticizing the ballad and making it appear as mere doggerel by jumbling the lines and altering the names and stanzas. We venture to say the Mail would not print in its columns the ballad itself. It has never done so. If it cares or dares to expose itself and its dupes to the public contempt by making room for a copy of the "Devil's Thirteen" in its pages, it can have one gratis by applying at this office.

HON. HONORE MERCIER.

Last week two priests of London discreetly visited the shrine of St. Anne de Beaupre. While staying at Quebec they were shown through the new parliamentary buildings. On hearing that Hon. Mr. Mercier could be seen in his official rooms, those gentlemen sent in their cards, and without much delay obtained a very pleasant and delightful interview with Quebec's Prime Minister. Although a grandfather, Mr. Mercier is still in the prime of manhood. His clear, frank expression and genial manners make one feel at home in his presence from his first look and the hearty welcome with which he greets the visitor. While conversing with him and listening to the charming anecdotes he tells so well it would be impossible to fancy him the astute politician his opponents represent him to be. When asked why no Irish Catholic had a seat in his cabinet, he replied that it was no fault of his. He declared himself a lover of Ireland and an ardent admirer of the little band of earnest and accomplished men who are engaged in the constitutional contest for Ireland's autonomy. He expressed the fervent hope that their efforts would be soon crowned with success, and that he would live to share in the joys of all Irishmen in celebrating Ireland's day of disenfranchisement. Asked if a successor to Mr. McShane would be appointed, he answered: "Most certainly; his place will be filled by an Irishman of talent, Mr. Fitzpatrick, a young barrister for whose ability and public merits I entertain the most profound respect." Mr. Mercier said that whoever charged him with prejudice against Irishmen would be guilty of a great act of injustice to him, and would be speaking against truth. He then mentioned the names of some Irishmen lately appointed to positions of trust and emolument, and among others he cited Mr. H. J. Cloran, barrister, whom he had lately made Queen's Counsellor and Crown Prosecutor in Montreal. The conversation then changed to religious matters, and private interviews he had with the Sovereign Pontiff, Pope Leo XIII. had presented him with a chalice and beautiful set of vestments and gave him permission to erect an altar and have Mass said in his private residence. This privilege he may enjoy when travelling, but the Bishop of the diocese should be duly notified. Yielding to a very pressing invitation, two rev. gentlemen called at Mr. Mercier's hospitable home that afternoon and were entertained by him and some members of his family at a sumptuous repast, of which the most agreeable seasoning was the wit and fan of the Hon. Prime Minister himself.

SUCCESSSES OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.

The Catholic schools of France have achieved a triumph which has had the effect of calling public attention to the fact that even secular education is none the more efficient when religion is excluded from the school room. The State schools under the present infidel Government exclude the very name of God from their text books, so that no time is wasted, as they express it, in religious exercises or teaching.

The Stanislas College of Paris, however, is under the management of priests, and the religious education of the students is carefully attended to. Nevertheless, at the recent public examinations, its pupils were far ahead of all the secular institutions. It is the grand ambition of Parisian students to take the first place at these annual competitive examinations, and this is the second year that the Stanislas College has distanced all others. Twelve colleges competed, the Stanislas College obtaining twenty first places and fifty accedes, making seventy places of honor, while Louis le Grand College, the second on the list, gained only forty-eight in all. The infidels are astounded, and give vent to their rage, threatening to abolish Catholic schools in every form.

They have always maintained that clerical teachers and religious orders are unfit to impart secular instruction, and that they are inferior to the Atheistic teachers who conduct the State schools. A few of the Radical journals, however, have acknowledged the truth which has forced itself upon their notice, and have come to the conclusion that in the religious schools the priests and religious teachers take more interest in their pupils than do lay teachers, especially those who, influenced solely by worldly motives in adopting their profession, have adopted it simply because they are paid so much per annum. One of these journals says:

"The undeniable superiority of the Stanislas College over the State schools arises from this that the pupils are not left to themselves, but are always under the care of their professors, from whom they receive constant and loving inspiration, and are always occupied profitably to themselves in many ways. Being avowed advocates of laicism, it is not pleasant for us to admit what we must say, that almost the only cause of the brilliant successes achieved by Stanislas College is its religious character."

We are pleased to be able to say that there are very few Catholic parents in this country who join in the outcry which is constantly raised against Catholic schools, and especially against Religious as teachers, but we regret to have to say that there are some such. They are influenced by the anti-Catholic press to believe that Catholic schools, whether elementary, academical or collegiate, must necessarily be inferior to Protestant institutions of the same kind. Do these parents reflect on the nature of the influences to which their children will be subjected in these anti-Catholic establishments? Anti-Catholic they must necessarily be when they are completely under anti-Catholic control. The textbooks, the books of the library to which they will have access, will be replete with anti-Catholic sentiments, and often anti-Christian; and as to morals there is too often little or no restraint to preserve, especially young girls, in non-Catholic boarding-academies, from dangerous occasions.

Of course we do not mean to say that Protestant boarding-schools expose their pupils purposely to those dangers, but they are practically without those restraints which come only from religion, and the characters of the children educated in them will be badly, or at least imperfectly, formed in consequence.

We have always maintained, as the Catholic Church holds, that the proper moral and religious training of youth is of the highest importance, even before the best secular education. Still we also hold that Catholic institutions should take care to give secular instruction of the highest order. We believe that, in this respect, our institutions in Ontario will compare favorably with those which are purely secular or Protestant, but if there are any which fall below the mark, they deserve to be passed over, and those should be patronized in preference which fulfil all the requirements. We certainly have many such in the Province which are doing good work in the education of the young of both sexes. Catholic parents should be careful to send their children to such institutions, and if they do not send them to the academies or colleges, they should send them to the Catholic Parochial or Separate schools.

That the Catholic schools are capable of giving a good account of themselves, if the school authorities do their duty, is evident from their success, not only in France, but also from similar successes which have been attained in England and the United States, especially in New York city, where, last year and this year, the public examinations resulted in placing the Catholic schools in the first rank, high above the State schools. In Ontario, too, the Catholic Separate schools have held their ground so well wherever they came into competition with the Public schools, that the figures given by the Hon. Mr. Ross in the Legislature, during the debate on Separate schools, showed that at the examinations for entrance into the High schools, the difference between the results from Public and Separate school pupils was scarcely appreciable, notwithstanding the fact that Separate schools labor under many disadvantages under the existing laws.

The success of the Stanislas College in France must have a good effect in convincing the French people generally that the atheistic government has proved itself traitorous to the best interests of the country by abolishing religion, and if the result should be that the French people shake off the apathy they have hitherto shown in tolerating an infidel government, the effect of the governmental examinations will be more beneficial and more far-reaching than ever the ministry anticipated.

ANTI-CHRIST AND THE WESTMINSTER CONFESSION.

It is not only in regard to the offer of salvation to a small part of mankind, and the doctrine of fatalism, as taught by Calvin, that the Westminster Confession needs revision. Dr. Philip Schaff, in a recent issue of the New York Independent, a Presbyterian journal, points out another subject on which Presbyterian doctrine, as set forth in the Confession, is as utterly at variance with Scriptural exegesis as with common sense, that is to say, the doctrine that the Pope is the "Man of Sin" whom St. Paul denounces, and the "anti-Christ" of whom St. John the Evangelist speaks in his Epistles.

From the beginning of Protestantism, the Reformers insisted on this as a doctrine revealed in Holy Writ. It was taught by Calvin, Luther, Melancthon, Beza, Musculus, Bullinger, David Chytrous, and at an earlier period by John Wicklif. It was incorporated by the Madeburgian Centurians in their profession of faith, and the English and Scotch Presbyterians have also made it an article of faith, placing it in the Westminster Confession in these words:

"Nor can the Pope of Rome in any sense be head thereof (of the Church); but is that anti-Christ, that man of sin, and son of perdition, that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and all that is called God."

Dr. Schaff completely explodes this favorite doctrine which, he says, is that of the early Protestants, namely, the Protestants of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. It is, however, still taught in many popular books, and is regarded by Protestants, both in England and on this continent, as a certain truth.

Dr. Schaff says: "This anti-Popery exegesis has been effectually undermined, yes, destroyed by modern scholarship which is not controlled by dogmatic prejudice and seeks the truth, and nothing but the truth. There is, we may well say, an exegetical consensus among critical commentators as regards those passages so far that they cannot—at least in their next and direct sense—refer to the Bishop of Rome. And this consensus of modern commentators is supported by the consensus of the ancient Fathers, Greek or Latin, favors the earlier Protestant exegesis on this subject."

He then points out that the second Epistle of St. Paul to the Thessalonians (II, 3, 10) is quoted in the Westminster Confession as proof that the Pope is meant by the Apostle who speaks of "the

anti-Christ, the man of sin, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped." On this text the Dr. says: "Now it is plain from the context, first, that Paul does not use the term anti-Christ; secondly, that he speaks of a hostile power that was already at work in his own time. He refers here to the seventh verse of the passage, which reads thus: 'for the mystery of iniquity already worketh; only that he who now holdeth, do hold, until he be taken out of the way.'"

Thirdly, that he calls the man of sin a mystery, of lawlessness (wrongly rendered iniquity, in King James' version), and this is the very opposite of the characteristic feature of Popery, which is a spiritual despotism; fourthly, that this man of sin makes himself a substitute for God, while the Pope claims to be the vicegerent of God and of Christ. If Paul had intended to warn against the rising Popery he would have done so in the Epistle to the Romans rather than in that to the Thessalonians in the East.

The term anti-Christ occurs only in the Epistles of John; and he uses it in a sense that makes it simply impossible to understand it of the Bishop of Rome or his future successors. For he writes to congregations in Asia Minor of things which were known to them as actual facts. He speaks of 'many anti-Christ' that are now' (I John II, 18). He points to persons who succeeded from the believers (verse 17) and never inwardly belonged to them. He characterizes them as false prophets who deny the mystery of the incarnation, the fundamental doctrine of the Gospel: 'Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is not of God, and this is that spirit of anti-Christ wherewith you have heard that it should come, and even now already is it in the world. The denial of the true divinity and humanity of Christ is the very last error which can be charged against the Papacy; but it fully applies to the Gnostic heresy which raised its head even in the Apostolic age in Simon Magus, the opponent of Peter, and in Cerinthus, the contemporary of John at Ephesus, and pervaded the Church of the second century, as Rationalism and Agnosticism pervade the Churches of to-day."

In regard to those passages of the Apocalypse (in Protestant English bibles called Revelation) which speak of the harlot of Babylon seated on the seven hills, and drunk with the blood of the Saints, the Dr. points out that it must indeed be Rome that is here meant, but that it is heathen, not Christian Rome. He remarks: "this book was intended to be a source of comfort and consolation under existing circumstances, and would have been of no practical value had it not been rooted and grounded in the actual situation of the Church at that time."

The Apocalypse was written while the persecution of Nero was fresh in the memory of the Apostle, and Dr. Schaff says it is simply impossible that "he should have ignored ancient heathen Rome, so well known to all his readers, and pointed to the mediæval Papacy of which they could not dream."

He makes a capital point when he remarks that Luther and Zwinglius did not regard the Apocalypse as an apocalyptic and canonical book, and that Protestant divines found it convenient to apply to the Pope the Apostle's denunciations against a persecuting heathen power.

Dr. Schaff is one of the most learned among the Presbyterian divines of the United States, and it was for this reason that he was selected by the Presbyterians to represent them on the committee to which was entrusted the work of revising the Protestant version of the Bible. He is by no means favorably disposed towards Catholics, and this fact renders his testimony the more valuable as regards the impudent teaching of the Westminster Confession; for it is certainly most impudent to apply to the Pope and to the Catholic Church, which has spread the faith of Christ throughout the world, words which are intended to designate a persecuting heathen power. Surely if the Apostles had intended to signify that the authority of the Pope is anti-Christian, there would have been some evidence among the early Christian writers, the Fathers of the Church, that their words were so understood by the Church in their day. But, as Dr. Schaff states, there is none. But the Doctor does not state what is the fact, that all the Fathers who speak of the Pope speak of him as St. Peter's successor, Christ's vicegerent, and head of the Church. So true is this that even the extremely anti-Catholic Church historian, Mosheim, while endeavoring to minimize the authority of the Pope, acknowledges that St. Cyprian and other Fathers of the third century recognized some sort of pre-eminence in the See of Rome. This was within one hundred years after the death of the Evangelist St. John. Certainly this does not look as if the primitive Church regarded St. Peter's successor in the same light as the Westminster divines.

The character of anti-Christ, as generally given by St. John, would accord very well with those Protestant modern sects which deny Christ's divinity; but it does not describe the Catholic Church, which has preached the doctrine of our redemption in every corner of the world. Indeed Protestantism everywhere is tending to Rationalism, and becoming daily more like what St. John describes anti-Christ to be. In France and Germany, even more than in England

and the United States, the divinity of Christ, and, consequently, the mystery of the Incarnation also, have already ceased to be doctrines of Protestantism.

Surely, then, the Westminster Confession stands badly in need of revision on this subject.

We may reasonably hope that whereas Presbyterians like Dr. Schaff are beginning to recognize the rays of truth, that this is a prelude to the return of many to the unity of faith in the Catholic Church.

A FAMINE THREATENED.

When rumors of a threatened famine first reached us from Ireland, we were naturally alarmed and could not help the exclamation, "God avert it! whatever is going to be the fate of unhappy Ireland?" Later reports show that the failure of the potato crop is not quite so general as at first supposed. Several counties are mentioned in which the fatal blight is but partially distributed, and no cry of alarm has been heard from the rich midland counties. But it should be remembered that in these localities, where the richest grasses and best pasture lands of the world are found, dairying and cattle raising are the chief resources of the farmers' income. Besides, we believe that, although not altogether independent of one single crop, as Ireland should be, she is to-day much better able to stand a potato famine than at any time of her history since the blight of foreign legislation came to darken her hitherto sunny hills and fertile plains. Owing to the Land League and National League agitation, owing to the heroic and patriotic work of Messrs. Davitt, Parnell, Dillon, O'Brien, and the others, the farmers in Ireland are no longer obliged to meet the exorbitant rackrents that in 1847 and 1848 exhausted their slender resources, and left them, when the potato was gone, to live on weeds or fly to America. If famine comes, then it will only affect the congested districts of Connaught and the seaboard and mountainous ranges of Kerry, Cork, Clare and Donegal. Of the latter county a letter to the Dublin Freeman, written by the learned and patriotic Bishop of Raphoe, Dr. O'Donnell, says: "The sad accounts furnished by your correspondents from the south and west of Ireland only too accurately describe the ravages of the potato blight here, also in the far North. With the exception of the Ligon district and an occasional spot elsewhere, the potato crop is a dead failure throughout Donegal. From personal observation I know that along the western seaboard and the inland mountainous parts of the country the early kinds are almost completely decayed, while the latter stalks were blackened with disease before the tubers had attained one-fourth the usual size. In a few months, I fear, there will be no potatoes fit for human food along the coast from Dunfanaghy to Killybegs."

Early in August Michael Davitt was consulting with scientific agriculturists to discover if some kind of vegetable could not be planted that would have time to ripen before the winter set in. Messrs. Dillon and O'Brien, in public speeches, have been advising the farmers to pay no rent until they see that all danger of perishing from hunger has passed away. They call upon Lord Salisbury and Balfour either to provide means of subsistence for the people of Ireland or to allow them to govern themselves. It is evidently beyond doubt that, although some parts of Ireland may not suffer from absolute want, there are very populous, in fact the most populous, districts, where there is every danger of hundreds, many thousands, being exposed, this coming winter, to experience the horrors of 1847 and 1848, when the population of Ireland, by famine, fever and forced emigration, was diminished by two millions and a half.

But what can be done to avert so direful a national calamity? The sad experience of the last ninety years of British rule ought to suffice to convince the English people that Ireland cannot flourish or live under foreign legislation. We hope that this visitation may be a blessing in disguise, and that the whole English nation will cry out "Shame on the Balfours and Salisburys." "Let the Irish people have their own Government. Let them have the privilege of developing their own resources. Let them build up their own manufactures, as in days of yore, when their linen and woolen goods were sought for and purchased at a premium in every European market."

This year's partial famine may be the straw that will break the camel's back. The Pigott forgeries, the wholesale evictions, the coercion laws and prison baronies of Balfour's government have sickened to loathing all men and women of heart and feeling in England and Scotland. Deaths by famine, and consequent fever and cholera, in Ireland, must precipitate English sentiment to a general uprising and an outcry that Tory cynicism cannot withstand. Whatever can be done by us in Canada, and by our fellow-countrymen in Australia and the United States, must be done, and at once, to prevent even one death from famine in a land teeming with natural resources. We are told that Messrs. Dillon, O'Brien, Hauly, and probably Parnell and the silver-tongued Sexton, may be seen here to educate us as to what must be done. But the necessity

of the Westminster Confession stands badly in need of revision on this subject.

We may reasonably hope that whereas Presbyterians like Dr. Schaff are beginning to recognize the rays of truth, that this is a prelude to the return of many to the unity of faith in the Catholic Church.

A FAMINE THREATENED.

When rumors of a threatened famine first reached us from Ireland, we were naturally alarmed and could not help the exclamation, "God avert it! whatever is going to be the fate of unhappy Ireland?" Later reports show that the failure of the potato crop is not quite so general as at first supposed. Several counties are mentioned in which the fatal blight is but partially distributed, and no cry of alarm has been heard from the rich midland counties. But it should be remembered that in these localities, where the richest grasses and best pasture lands of the world are found, dairying and cattle raising are the chief resources of the farmers' income. Besides, we believe that, although not altogether independent of one single crop, as Ireland should be, she is to-day much better able to stand a potato famine than at any time of her history since the blight of foreign legislation came to darken her hitherto sunny hills and fertile plains. Owing to the Land League and National League agitation, owing to the heroic and patriotic work of Messrs. Davitt, Parnell, Dillon, O'Brien, and the others, the farmers in Ireland are no longer obliged to meet the exorbitant rackrents that in 1847 and 1848 exhausted their slender resources, and left them, when the potato was gone, to live on weeds or fly to America. If famine comes, then it will only affect the congested districts of Connaught and the seaboard and mountainous ranges of Kerry, Cork, Clare and Donegal. Of the latter county a letter to the Dublin Freeman, written by the learned and patriotic Bishop of Raphoe, Dr. O'Donnell, says: "The sad accounts furnished by your correspondents from the south and west of Ireland only too accurately describe the ravages of the potato blight here, also in the far North. With the exception of the Ligon district and an occasional spot elsewhere, the potato crop is a dead failure throughout Donegal. From personal observation I know that along the western seaboard and the inland mountainous parts of the country the early kinds are almost completely decayed, while the latter stalks were blackened with disease before the tubers had attained one-fourth the usual size. In a few months, I fear, there will be no potatoes fit for human food along the coast from Dunfanaghy to Killybegs."

Early in August Michael Davitt was consulting with scientific agriculturists to discover if some kind of vegetable could not be planted that would have time to ripen before the winter set in. Messrs. Dillon and O'Brien, in public speeches, have been advising the farmers to pay no rent until they see that all danger of perishing from hunger has passed away. They call upon Lord Salisbury and Balfour either to provide means of subsistence for the people of Ireland or to allow them to govern themselves. It is evidently beyond doubt that, although some parts of Ireland may not suffer from absolute want, there are very populous, in fact the most populous, districts, where there is every danger of hundreds, many thousands, being exposed, this coming winter, to experience the horrors of 1847 and 1848, when the population of Ireland, by famine, fever and forced emigration, was diminished by two millions and a half.

But what can be done to avert so direful a national calamity? The sad experience of the last ninety years of British rule ought to suffice to convince the English people that Ireland cannot flourish or live under foreign legislation. We hope that this visitation may be a blessing in disguise, and that the whole English nation will cry out "Shame on the Balfours and Salisburys." "Let the Irish people have their own Government. Let them have the privilege of developing their own resources. Let them build up their own manufactures, as in days of yore, when their linen and woolen goods were sought for and purchased at a premium in every European market."

This year's partial famine may be the straw that will break the camel's back. The Pigott forgeries, the wholesale evictions, the coercion laws and prison baronies of Balfour's government have sickened to loathing all men and women of heart and feeling in England and Scotland. Deaths by famine, and consequent fever and cholera, in Ireland, must precipitate English sentiment to a general uprising and an outcry that Tory cynicism cannot withstand. Whatever can be done by us in Canada, and by our fellow-countrymen in Australia and the United States, must be done, and at once, to prevent even one death from famine in a land teeming with natural resources. We are told that Messrs. Dillon, O'Brien, Hauly, and probably Parnell and the silver-tongued Sexton, may be seen here to educate us as to what must be done. But the necessity