

The Catholic Record
Published every Friday morning at 466 Richmond Street.
THOS. GOSPEY,
Publisher and Proprietor.
Annual subscription..... \$2 00
Six months..... 1 00
Arrears must be paid before the paper can be stopped.

LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSH.
London, Ont., May 23, 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 principles; that it will remain, what 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. 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,"
FROM HIS GRACE ARCHBISHOP HANNAH.
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 HANNAH,
Archbishop of Halifax.

LETTER FROM MGR. POWER.
The following letter was given to our agent in Halifax by Mgr. Power, administrator of the Archdiocese of Halifax.
St. Mary's, Halifax, N. S., June 29, 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.
From my long personal knowledge of your high character for integrity, I can cheerfully recommend you to those on whom you may call, in the course of business, as a person in every respect worthy of confidence.
Hoping you may obtain a long list of subscribers, and wishing a blessing on your good work.
I am, sincerely yours,
PATRICK M. POWER,
Administrator.

Catholic Record.
LONDON, FRIDAY, JULY 28, 1882.

PERSONAL.

His Lordship Bishop Walsh, of London, accompanied by the Very Rev. Dean Wagner, of Windsor, and Rev. Father Flannery, of St. Thomas, left for Europe on Monday last.

THE POSITION INTOLERABLE.

The Roman question, or, in other words, the temporal independence of the Pope, continues to attract very general attention. The recent pamphlet of M. Emile Ollivier on this important subject, wherein he proves the present position of the Holy Father to be intolerable, is one of the evidences of the awakening of Europe to a true perception of the disgraceful breach of right, individual and international, perpetrated on the Roman Pontiff on the 20th of September, 1870. M. Ollivier's testimony is all the more valuable on account of his well-known regard for Italy, and his earnest desire to see its independence secured and its greatness promoted. He is, besides, ardently devoted to the principles of '89, as he himself affirms. "For my part," he says, in one portion of his pamphlet, "for my part, raised in the worship of the ideas of '89, I will not disown my first love. On the contrary, the more I observe the current of events from a disinterested standpoint, the more clearly I understand the benefits of the French revolution; the more I admire it, the more I attach myself to its cause. Say what men may, do as they may, this will ever remain one of the happiest dates of human history, the precursor of one of its brightest ages, and the counter-revolution shall never prevail against it." This very ardent and decided declaration of devotion to the principles of the great revolution shows the writer to be completely free from the so-called clerical tendencies which, in the eyes of some, might weaken the strength of his arguments. With many of them we cannot agree, for they are, unfortunately, tinged with the liberalism in which it was M. Ollivier's misfortune to be educated. But, notwithstanding the shortcomings of his training, intellectual and political, the ex-minister of the Second Empire has not been vainly endowed with keen perception; he has not purposelessly held the highest place a Frenchman could in his day hold; he has not unprofitably spent the years of his retirement from politics—ceasing to observe the march of human events with the lessons they inculcate. The sovereign under whom M. Ollivier served as first minister did more for the unification of Italy than Cavour in the cabinet or Garibaldi in the field could have ever accomplished. The consolidation of Italy was truly the realization of a Napoleonic idea, and M. Ollivier,

to whom Napoleonic ideas are yet dear, would fain contribute all his power to preserve intact a structure owing existence to a sovereign from whom he had received the highest honor. To this desire, and not to a fixed purpose to serve the Papacy at the expense of Italy, must be attributed the appearance of the ex-minister's pamphlet on the Roman question. From a Catholic standpoint, the pamphlet is far, indeed, from faultless, the writer declaring in his ninth chapter that the restoration of the temporal power, after the ancient form, would prove incompatible with the well-being of the Roman people. This very assumption he himself demolishes by his admission of the good effects of papal administrations under the ancient form, and his declaration that there remain very few, even ecclesiastics, who conceive a restoration of the temporal power, whether extended or restricted, possible without a new organization adapted to the necessities of the times. This is a very just view, and had M. Ollivier devoted himself to its elaboration instead of to useless strictures upon the former administration of affairs under the Papal government, he would have greatly strengthened his argument. Every one knows that when the temporal power is restored it will be under circumstances and conditions of society, as well as political organizations and affiliations, vastly different from those subsisting even as late as 1870. And as the papacy during its former temporal regime fully met all the wants of society and of political organizations, so it will in the future and more brilliant temporal regime to come. M. Ollivier himself confesses that the pontifical government was always worthy of admiration for the solicitude with which it guarded its subjects against sufferings, and further on declares that the personal initiative of the Pope always supplied whatever was wanting in their administrative institutions themselves. Of no other sovereigns in Europe, however illustrious, by talent, learning and virtue, can the same be said. Of no state governed even according to the cherished ideas of '89 could M. Ollivier make the same declaration.

On the whole, the ex-minister's production is conceived and written in a candid and broad-minded spirit, its imperfections being due to defects of his "liberal" education. His demonstration of the present intolerable position of the Papacy has aroused a deep feeling of indignation amongst infidel journalists, who have sought to destroy its effect by studied silence and contempt. Catholic journalists, on the other hand, have given the production of M. Ollivier the benefit of the fullest notice and criticism. *Le Monde* says of it: "The principal fact brought into the light by M. Ollivier is the threatened and uncertain position of the Sovereign Pontiff which pains and humiliates Catholics throughout the world, and is an insult to every state, royal or republican, having under its jurisdiction a greater or less number of Catholics."

If any doubt could be entertained of the intolerable position of the Pope in Rome, the *Journal de Rome* sets it at rest in an able article published some short time ago. The writer takes the just ground that the demonstrations held in Rome after the death of Garibaldi were a veritable manifestation of hostility to the Papacy, in fact, an open declaration of war upon it. These demonstrations were organized and headed by avowed enemies of the Holy See. They were held in honor of a man who had declared the Papacy was the deadliest foe of Italy and of the civilized world. One of the leading spirits of the movement affirmed that "the funeral cortege of Sunday last was the burial of the Papacy itself. The Vatican neither sees nor understands anything, but soon it will be made both to see and understand." Thus, as the *Journal de Rome* maintains, have the radicals passed from insult to menace in regard of the Pope. The Italian government looks on connivingly at all the doings of these misguided men. If the language of violence employed of late in Rome towards the Holy Father were employed in regard of

the humblest citizen, it would be the duty of the government at once to intervene to punish such inflammatory speech. But under the Savoyard regime in Rome, the Sovereign Pontiff has not the rights of even the humblest citizen. He is placed entirely beyond the pale of legal protection. The government of the Quirinal seems to ignore the very existence of the Pope in Rome. And this is the government that pledged itself to treat the Pope as a sovereign! The Catholic world now sees the full value of such a pledge from such a government. It now clearly understands that the Holy Father is not free in Rome, that his position there is truly intolerable. Insulted, menaced, and outraged, his lot in the Eternal City itself is worse than that of the lowest follower of the radical Garibaldian cortege. This is a state of things which surely cannot be maintained.

Commenting upon the encyclical addressed some months ago by the Holy Father to the bishops of Italy, the *Dublin Review*, in a remarkable article, discusses the Roman question at length. In his encyclical the Holy Father, as our readers remember, urged on the bishops the necessity of bringing about a solution of the existing difficulty, by the establishment of Catholic societies, the encouragement of the Catholic press and the proper training of the clergy. The Holy Father also then affirmed the necessity of the temporal power for the Church, the Pope being, as things now stand, under the domination of enemies: that right and justice demand the restoration of his temporal sovereignty; and that all Catholics are bound to make common cause for the increase of faith and the promotion of Christian morality. The *Review* mentions three possible solutions of the Roman problem, 1st, the temporary abandonment of Rome by the Pope, 2ndly, the intervention of European statesmen and diplomatists to bring about a restoration of the temporal power, 3rdly, the restitution of the temporal sovereignty to the Pope by the Italian nation itself. As to the first of these proposed solutions, the *Review* considers it improbable that the Pope will leave Rome. In fact, in our estimation, nothing but sheer force will drive him from the Eternal City. But force may at any time be employed to compass this avowed purpose of his enemies. The *Review* gives many pertinent reasons why a removal from Rome would operate injuriously to the Church. However miserable the present state of things, Rome is, as the writer states, always Rome. The Pope in Rome is Pope in his own city. He is, for the present, a prisoner, but the influence of his presence is felt. His leaving Rome would be a source of genuine and universal regret amongst Catholics. As to the second of the solutions mentioned by the *Review*, it is hardly probable from the present outlook that any conjoint diplomatic intervention will be made by the European powers. Besides, any such intervention would only serve to further irritate the Italian people and render the position of the Sovereign Pontiff, even with the temporal power, painful and difficult. The third solution, if feasible, were in all respects the most satisfactory. The Italian Catholics have thus far taken no part in Parliamentary elections, but it is believed that the time is at hand when the ecclesiastical authorities will urge them to such united political action as will make their power felt. We doubt not that if the masses of the Italian people were properly disciplined and organized under Catholic auspices and influence, the radical minority that now rules the nation would be speedily driven from power. In any such eventuality an arrangement could be effected to secure the temporal independence of the Supreme Pontiff by the consent of the Italian people themselves. By the adoption of the three means pointed out by the Holy Father in his encyclical this desirable result must, after a time, be attained. The *Review* sums up the whole situation very aptly in declaring that either the king of Italy or the Pope must leave Rome. If the king leaves Rome he will have the support of the Catho-

lics enlisted to maintain his sovereignty, if he remains he simply awaits destruction at the hands of the radicals.

THE SITUATION IN RUSSIA.

From the time the Nihilists, by their activity and audacity first began to disturb the internal peace of Russia, the political condition of that country has attracted wide-spread attention abroad. The system of government there being autocratic in one of its very worst forms, a great deal depends as to the policy of the government upon the *personel* of the administration. Herein consists one of the great weaknesses of the Russian government, for frequently there may be at one time in the service of the sovereign several powerful ministers with views quite diverse, if not antagonistic, both on domestic and foreign policy. To the English speaking world, accustomed to the constitutional system, wherein one powerful minister guides the course and frames the policy of an administration, his colleagues giving him ready support and assistance, this would, at first sight, certainly appear anomalous. But under the system of absolute government, such as the Russian, unless one minister be powerful enough to procure from the sovereign the appointment of creatures of his own, as heads of state departments, this to us strange state of affairs must frequently arise. At this very moment, when the policy of almost every other European government is fixed, determined and identified with some powerful and popular ministerial chief, it is impossible to know what views possess controlling influence in Russia. The modern constitutionalist, the old Russian, the pan-slavist, the absolutist, and federal parties have all representatives in the Russian Cabinet. Its domestic policy is consequently shifting and uncertain, while its foreign policy exhibits a lack of purpose and steadiness that must, in a few years, deprive Russia of influence abroad. At one time we hear of seemingly earnest professions of friendship for Germany coming from governmental circles at St. Petersburg, at another it is announced that ministers view with approval the declarations of pan-slavism and the spreading of that movement with positive pleasure. Thus, there is no fixedness of design in the attitude of the Russian government, all on account of the cause we have just assigned. Then there is constant intrigue amongst ministers themselves, resulting in sudden changes that tend only to weaken the efficiency of the administration. One day a minister may believe himself completely in the ascendant, the very next he may meet with an ignominious fall. Such was the recent substitution of Count Tolstoy for Gen. Ignatieff. The promotion of M. de Giers to the ministry of foreign affairs led many to believe that any subsequent change which might be made, would be in the direction of a Cabinet, truly homogeneous in its determination to bring Russia into accord with modern ideas of government. But this expectation has been rudely dispelled by the appointment of Tolstoy in the stead of Ignatieff. The real power behind the throne in the Russian government now is Katkow, by whose machinations Ignatieff was driven from place. Katkow is an able and audacious if not unscrupulous politician. His evident ambition is to assume himself, after a time, full control of affairs. The present he judges not an opportune moment to take such responsibility. He therefore makes use of a friend who will be guided principally by his advice. When he does form a government, it will, we believe, be free from the weakness of the present. It will reflect the views of one man and be guided by some definite, well-ascertained purpose, otherwise it must suffer, as have its predecessors, from inefficiency. Meantime it is satisfactory to know that Count Tolstoy, notwithstanding his well-known attachment to the Russian orthodox church, is not a friend of religious persecution, and that during his term of office he will place no obstacle in the way of an *entente cordiale* being reached between Russia and the Vatican.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The crop reports from Ireland are most deplorable. In the North-West hay is lying cut in the fields and the potatoes are blighted. Reports from other portions of the country are almost equally discouraging. Ireland is, therefore, again threatened by her old foe, famine. In any such emergency a paternal government would at the earliest moment take steps to save the people from death by starvation. All, however, that the British government can give Ireland is a repression act, cruel, tyrannical, nay criminal. Is it surprising then that there is discontent and confusion in that unhappy country? America upon a former occasion had to relieve the Irish from starvation, and it now looks as if a like work would again fall to her lot. The landlords advocated emigration as the panacea for Ireland's troubles. The cure is now apparently to be administered by the ghastly hand of famine.

The growth of Winnipeg is one of the wonders of the age. Twelve years ago a mere hamlet, it is now an imposing city of more than 30,000 inhabitants, with prospects of doubling or perhaps trebling that number within the next ten years. It is evidently destined to become the greatest of Canadian cities. The completion of the Canadian Pacific R. R. to Prince Arthur's Landing brings it into communication through the great lakes of old Canada with the commercial centres of Ontario and Quebec. The rapid construction of the same road over the western prairie country, which will forever depend on Winnipeg as its great trading mart, will every day, as it progresses, add to the importance and growth of the new city. Some idea may be formed of the rapidity of Winnipeg's advancement when we mention that the municipal authorities purpose expending on local improvements this year about \$900,000, and much more may be required. We are glad that the real estate craze of last fall and winter has died away. Real estate business has taken more healthful features, much to the benefit of the city and to the moral tone of its people. The sanitary condition of the city is not quite satisfactory, but will, no doubt, be improved at once. The growth of Winnipeg may be safely taken as an index of the future in store for the great Canadian North-West.

Two leading Quebec journals, *Le Canadien* and *Le Courrier du Canada*, have very justly protested against the erection of the new Court House for the district of Quebec on the site of the old Jesuit Barracks. The site in question is part of the property formerly in possession of the Jesuits in Canada, of which the Church was deprived by the government shortly after the conquest. The seizure of this property was an act of the gravest injustice. The time is now opportune for restitution, and we do trust that the Catholic press of Canada will make its voice plainly heard on behalf of right. If the government persist in their desire to build the Court House on the property of the Jesuits, for their property the old Barracks site still justly is, let them compensate its true owners. Compensation, however inadequate, would establish the legal ownership of the Society of Jesus not only in that piece of property but in all the rest taken from them at the time of the expropriation. We feel assured that the government, if disposed to come to an amicable arrangement, will meet with no difficulty on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities of Quebec. The latter insist upon right being done, and in the position they assume in this matter have the support of all Catholic Canada.

The prediction often made in these columns that Canada would soon have a Chinese question to deal with, is now about to be verified. The present steady and rapid influx of Chinamen into British Columbia renders it certain that unless some measures be at once taken to prevent their immigration that province will be to all extents and purposes a Chinese province. From

Victoria, B. C., came the other day a despatch that a Chinese company was preparing to erect workshops there to manufacture clothing, boots and shoes, tinware, cigars, etc., and enter into competition with the white firms. As no white firm can procure labor at the figure the Chinese companies can procure it, any such competition, if carried out, will drive all white laborers from Victoria and ultimately from Vancouver. But before any such event takes place, we may expect trouble of a very serious character. Decisive action just now might prevent out-breaks of a grave nature on the Canadian Pacific coast.

The Conservative peers have, it would seem, decided to allow the Arrears Bill to pass the Lords. The reason given by the Conservative leader, the Marquis of Salisbury, for advising his titled supporters not to reject the bill is one that clearly shows the utter disregard of the average English statesman for Irish interests. It is well known that the Arrears bill is a measure of absolute necessity for Ireland. Without its passage, the land difficulty were as far from settlement as ever. No administration advancing the slightest claim to honesty could refuse to deal in some such manner as this bill proposes to deal with the enormous arrears of rent for which the Irish tenantry is legally responsible, but absolutely unable to pay. So long as these arrears remain unsettled the tenant is subject at any moment to eviction with its attendant evils. The Arrears bill, relieving the tenants of the burden of debt and the danger of eviction, will work very great benefit to the Irish people. The Marquis of Salisbury does not, however, take the Irish into consideration at all. He recommends the passage of the bill on account of the gravity of the Egyptian crisis. To Arabi Bey, therefore, and not to Salisbury or the English peers, will the Irish be indebted for the passage of the Arrears Bill.

The official figures of the births, deaths, and marriages in Ireland for the year 1881 give very positive indications of the unhappy state of that country. The number of births for the year was much less than for any of the ten preceding years. In 1871 the registered births amounted to 51,000, in 1881 the figures show a diminution of 15,000. In the first named year the ratio of marriages was 5.7, in 1881 it had fallen to 4 in each thousand of the population. Besides, emigration has of late years assumed gigantic proportions. A few years ago Ireland's population was 5,292,000; to-day it is barely above 5,000,000. These figures speak volumes in themselves. A falling population is one of the plainest and most incontrovertible proofs of misgovernment. Ireland's population can never exhibit a normal or healthy growth till order, peace and justice be restored to that hapless country.

The French Chamber of Deputies, true to its anti-christian instincts, has decreed the expropriation and demolition of the church of the Sacred Heart at Montmartre. This church, erected by the pious contributions of the French faithful, is now a state property. It has not been shown that neither in itself or anything connected with it, this monument of Catholic zeal and devotedness has been, or could be, made prejudicial to the interests of France or even of republicanism. But evincing, as it does, the strength of the faith yet animating the masses of the French nation, it is an object of intense hatred to the radical party. The government of the day offered but feeble resistance to this monstrous act of desecration and spoliation. Instead of meeting the proposal by direct opposition, ministers simply beat about the bush, assigning every reason but those which true statesmen would have assigned for their opposition to the measure. The more serious and thoughtful amongst the republicans themselves are alarmed at the action of the Chamber of Deputies. The *Journal des Debats* views with uneasiness the committing of the country to any such course by pursuing which the