

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE CATHOLIC RECORD CO. LTD. LONDON, ENGLAND.

GENERAL AGENTS: Messrs. Donald Crowe and Luke King, OTTAWA AGENCY.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and the Archbishop of St. Michael's, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 1887

A CARD.

Some of our contemporaries, the Irish Canadian prominent among the number, assert that the appointment of Mr. P. J. Coffey to the registration of Carleton is the result of a corrupt bargain between the Mowat Government and the Rev. J. F. Coffey, who writes for the CATHOLIC RECORD, and that in consequence of this alleged bargain the CATHOLIC RECORD used its power and influence against the Conservative party during the late local elections.

We have a right to expect that the Irish Canadian and the other journals that have been in such hot haste to bear false witness against the RECORD will have the honesty to publish this card, with a view to a just reparation.

THOS. COFFEY, Proprietor CATHOLIC RECORD.

OUR GOVERNOR GENERAL.

We ask our readers to go back with us to this time four years ago. It was then first mooted that the choice of the British Cabinet of a successor for the Marquis of Lansdowne had fallen upon the Marquis of Lansdowne. We opposed the appointment. The CATHOLIC RECORD was the first paper in Canada that took this ground, and having taken it, we held it unflinchingly while opposition was of any avail.

standing and such a record was not the person to send to administer the affairs of a free government, to represent the royal authority in the midst of a free people, who hold Irish landlordism, with all its works and pomps, in undivided reprobation and unmitigated execration. We pointed out that the necessities of our position demanded a governor-general acceptable to all classes of our fellow-citizens. We held that not alone should the nobleman filling this high office be so acceptable, but that he should command the hearty respect of the people of the United States. A rack-renting, evicting, and exterminating Irish landlord was not the man assuredly to fill the bill in this regard.

The news has reached this side of the Atlantic that the "Plan of Campaign" has been adopted on the Queen's County estates of Lord Lansdowne. The Plan of Campaign is adopted only where rack-renting prevails and just abatement is refused. The very defence published in the Ottawa press at the Governor General's own instance, is in itself an admission of every charge formulated against him by the Irish National League. Here it is: "The 'Plan of Campaign' was adopted on the Queen's County estate in consequence of Lord Lansdowne's refusal to allow to the tenants upon it a scale of abatements identical with that allowed to his tenants in the County of Kerry. The Kerry tenants are almost without exception the occupants of small holdings in a mountainous country with little or no capital, except their own labour, and have experienced exceptional losses during the last season. The reasons for which these tenants were in Lord Lansdowne's opinion entitled to a special measure of indulgence were fully stated in a letter published in the Irish papers in October last and republished by the Canadian press. Lord Lansdowne's Queen's County tenants belong to an entirely different class, the greater portion of the estate being held by large farmers, many of whom pay several hundred a year for their holdings. The two ringleaders against whom Lord Lansdowne is now proceeding are rented approximately at £300 and £1,300 a year respectively. These as well as other tenants who have adopted the 'Plan of Campaign,' although they have held under lease for many years past, and were therefore protected from an increase of rent when the prices of agricultural produce were high, constantly received abatements during the recent period of depression, and were in November last offered reductions averaging between 15 and 20 per cent. The dwellings upon these estates are, as a rule, of a superior class, the larger tenants being without exception provided with excellent houses and homesteads. Evidence was given by Lord Lansdowne before a Royal Commission that during the past twenty years £20,000 had been spent by him and his predecessors in executing improvements for the tenants on this estate, and that the percentage charged upon this large outlay to those for whose benefit it was incurred amounted to only £300 a year. As an indication of the nature of the relations which existed upon this property between landlord and tenant previous to the agitation now in progress, it may be mentioned that during the past twelve years only one eviction for non-payment of rent had taken place upon the whole property."

reach they would not make to keep that peace and homelike content which is their life long aim and ceaseless object. Nothing, then, but direct necessity could drive these "large farmers" many of whom pay several hundred a year for their holdings, to adopt the plan of campaign. In taking this course they deserve the support of their fellow-countrymen at home, and of all just minded men abroad. Lord Lansdowne cannot justify his eviction of these farmers by his boasted expenditure of a few thousand pounds on his Irish estates. His ancestors and himself have for many generations wrung hundreds of thousands of pounds from a pinched, famishing and persecuted tenantry, from whom the soil that the noble lord claims as his own was stolen by monarchs, rapacious and blood-thirsty, to reward the nameless vagabonds and heartless adventurers who planted English rule in Ireland. His defence is, we repeat, a confession of guilt. It is an admission of wrong-doing that no amount of sophistry or appeals to side issues can obliterate. Lord Lansdowne has deliberately placed himself outside the sympathy of the right thinking of all countries, and taken, after due reflection, we would fain believe, a position of decided hostility to the Irish people at home and abroad. Of his action he must bear the consequences. One thing we are certain of, an evicting Irish landlord cannot be a successful governor-general of Canada. This great Dominion, with its five millions of self-governing people, cannot bear the dishonor of being ruled by a governor openly identified with the most inhuman system that has disgraced modern times, the rack-renting, blood-sucking, heaven-cursed landlordism of Ireland. The Marquis of Lansdowne will render the Dominion a priceless service by relinquishing at once its government into hands more humane and generous than his own.

Since writing the above we have received the following comments of Mr. Wm. O'Brien on Lord Lansdowne's defence of his evictions: "New York, April 3.—Mr. T. P. Gill, M. P., writes as follows to 'The Tribune':—'In answer to set of queries which I sent today to William O'Brien, editor of United Ireland, I have received the following:—'You have seen the cable account of Lord Lansdowne's apology for the Luggercurran evictions?' 'Yes, it is grossly disingenuous and misleading. He strives to imply that his evictions do not exceed the Government valuation. This is absolutely untrue of the two tenants evicted. The rent of Danne is 35 per cent. above the Government valuation and that of Kiltbride actually 85 per cent. Lord Lansdowne slurs over the fact that the tenants holding under judicial rents, he refused any abatement whatsoever. The tenants' interest in the value of the farms held under judicial lease was put up for sale last June, owing to the excessive rent. No purchaser could be found and the farm was surrendered as a result. Notwithstanding this fact, and the report of the Government valuation, prices have fallen on 1 1/2 per cent. since the judicial rents were fixed. Lord Lansdowne offered no abatement to the poor judicial holders, but attempted to isolate them by bribing the large holders with special abatements. It was because they rejected what he offers to tenants that they were with their poorer brethren that they were the first singled out for eviction. The two tenants who were evicted are not really rich men. They once were, but almost all their capital is gone in paying ruinous rents during seven years of loss. Mr. Danne is £2,000 a poorer man to day than he was in 1879, owing to his punctual payment of rent. The only two well-to-do tenants were cunningly picked out for eviction in the belief that English sympathy would not be extended to men evicted from handsome residences as it would to men evicted from hovels; but, on the contrary, the more comfortable the residences Danne and Kiltbride quitted, the more fearful must be the presence of rack-renters that compelled them and their brother tenants to run such risks. But for the stand made by these two large holders the struggle heretics could have been crushed and evicted without trouble. It is true that the tenants owe three half years' rent. It is totally false that they were the best paying tenants in the country, so long as they were able. They only owe one half year's rent. The law requires one full year's rent should be due before eviction. In order to evict Lord Lansdowne had to add to the one half year's rent really due a mythical debt called a 'hauling' which is a half year's rent running on for several generations, but never enforced except as a lever for eviction."

"Why have the evictions been suspended?" "I suspect because Canadian opinion was beginning to make Lord Lansdowne uncomfortable. They will unquestionably be resumed if he finds Canada apathetic to his conduct. Only for the urgency of the struggle here at home I would be on my way to Canada at this moment. I have received pressing invitations from Ottawa, Toronto and Montreal. I shall certainly go if Lord Lansdowne carries out his threat of exterminating the remainder of the tenantry. As it is, his eviction of Danne and Kiltbride has been accompanied by the eviction of all their poor laborers, 25 in number, and the suffering of these men who are thrown idle, and to their poor families, is heartrending."

We beg to call the attention of our readers to some exquisite lines of poetry "Easter Morn," which appear in our columns this week. They will repay perusal. We hope the authoress will continue to favor the columns of the RECORD with her truly religious poetic genius.

MODERN CLAIMS OF ANGLICANISM.

II.

THE AUTHORITY OF THE POPE.

In our first paper on the modern claims of Anglicanism we demonstrated the inherent absurdity of the Anglican theory that the Church of Christ on earth consists of a number of independent organizations. The absurdity is the same whether the independent Churches be national or diocesan. The English Church theory is that each nation should have its own Church; but the arguments wherewith they attempt to prove this would, if they were directed, rather prove that every diocese is independent of every other diocese, so that there should be as many independent churches as there are cities sufficiently important to require a Bishop. Bishop Cox states "the Church of England never was a part of the Roman Catholic Church." Of course if he had meant that the modern Church of England, as it was created by Parliament, with the king at its head as supreme, subject to the king and Parliament in doctrine and discipline, and cut off by heresy and schism from the living universal organism of the Church Catholic, it is true that this Church never was part of the Church Catholic and Roman, which alone is entitled to be called Catholic at all, and in this case the Bishop would have been right. But this is not his meaning. He meant to say that the Catholic Church in England, as she existed in the days of St. Augustine, and earlier, also in the days of Alfred and St. Anselm, down to the time of the Reformation, never acknowledged the Pope's supreme authority. This is evident from the whole tenor of his Toronto lectures. He says "there were never Roman Catholic ages in England." The claims of the Pope to supremacy he tells us began with Pope Nicholas "in the ninth century." At this period certain forged decretals which attributed great authority to the Pope "were used as a weapon upon the wooden frame on which he builds an arch" and "in 870 the papacy by the aid of the decretals established the papacy with popular ignorance on one side and despotism on the other." In England "while princes were ready to make terms with the Pontiff, there were always men like Stephen Langton to prevent the encroachments of Rome going too far." He adds that "the strange usurpations" of the popes were put forward "through the connivance of princes."

It is true that in the ninth century certain documents were issued which were falsely attributed to early Popes from St. Clement to Pope Damasus, but these forged documents were not the basis on which the authority of the Pope was founded. On the contrary, it was because the authority of the Pope was recognized that these forgeries possessed a plausibility. There is abundance of evidence to show that the supreme authority of the Pope was always acknowledged by the church. From the very beginning of ecclesiastical history, the Pope was always the foremost to condemn errors of doctrine, and to sustain the discipline of the church, and bishops in every country recognized their right and duty of interference whenever any cause of magnitude arose. If there were any bishop or patriarch who could claim exemption from the Pope's authority such exemption would belong above all to the bishops and patriarchs of the east, but none are more explicit than eastern bishops in asserting the Pope's prerogatives, and this long before the date assigned by Bishop Cox to their establishment. The famous Council of Chalcedon, held in 451, in their report of their proceedings sent to Pope St. Leo, say "it was he that presided by his legate, as the head presides over all the members of the body."

St. Cyril of Alexandria, writing to Pope Celestine against Nestorius, says "As God himself imposes on us the duty, and the wisdom and the ancient traditions of the church bind us to report all matters to your holiness, I feel it my duty to inform you that Satan is exciting new agitations against the church."

Elsewhere, in his "treasures" St. Cyril says it is necessary that we, being members, should remain attached to our head, who is the Bishop of Rome, and the Apostolic See: it is from him that we are to ask what we must believe and hold; for he alone can blame, correct and reprimand us, or strengthen us and keep us in the right, and bid and loose."

The Eastern Church to this day attests the antiquity of the doctrine of the Pope's Supremacy, for though they refuse to acknowledge his authority, the prayers and hymns which they still recite in their liturgy attest that the doctrine dates from before their separation into a distinct Church. Thus on the feast of the Popes the sacred canticles of the liturgy style them "successors to the throne of the head of the Apostles, the heads of the Church," and use other similar expressions. St. Sylvester, in his address in a canticone on his feast day, January 2: "O most holy head of the Apostles, and thou hast been a most admirable Minister of God by embellishing, confirming and glorifying the Church by divine dogmas."

BASE, BLOODY AND BRUTAL.

BASE, BLOODY AND BRUTAL.

The Salisbury Government has laid on the table of the Commons House of Parliament its "Irish Criminal Law Amendment Bill," an euphonious title for a measure of baseness, brutality and blood— a measure which the *Pall Mall Gazette* says, "subjecting, as it does, white-skinned Christians and civilized beings to arbitrary interference with the rights of man, justifies an insurrection—a measure against which, if the Irish revolt, they will have the sympathy and support of the world—a measure against which, if they do not revolt—the *Pall Mall Gazette* rightly declares they will deserve to be contempt. This new demagogical contrivance of tyranny has excited a feeling of world-wide indignation against the Salisbury government. The English nation itself stands appalled at the magnitude of the outrage proposed to be inflicted on Ireland. In America the new coercion infamy is received with indignation and universal feelings of horror that have stirred the popular mind as it has not been moved since the epoch of the civil war. What does the Tory scheme of blood and treachery propose? It proposes the abolition of trial by jury in certain cases, the change of venue to England in other cases of factitious crime, the enlargement of the Orange magistracy's jurisdiction, and, in a word, the crushing out of the whole machinery for popular constitutional agitation, the substitution of the most odious and diabolical tyranny for the few forms of free government still enjoyed by Ireland. Mr. Parnell, in his despatch of March 25th, to the Hon. John Fitzgerald, President of the Irish National League of America, stamps the proposal with infamy:

"The Coercion bill proposed to-night in the House of Commons is the 87th since the Act of Union 87 years ago. It is called for by the state of affairs in Ireland. Never before has a Coercion bill been proposed since crime was so rapidly decreasing as compared with previous years. The measure is aimed against all open agitation and appears to be expressly designed for driving discontent at the surface. It places all public speakers, writers and conductors of newspapers, and all holders of their offices at the pleasure of the Crown. It condemns the Irish speaking peasant of a rack-rented Kerry to the tender mercies of a packed jury of Orange-men or landlords, or to a jury of Englishmen at the old Bailey in London. The Liberal party, headed by Gladstone, stands as one man against this iniquitous measure, and will fight shoulder to shoulder with us in opposing it to the last. It seems impossible to believe that even the present House of Commons will continue to follow the Tory government in their mad course, and good judges consider the measure will break and ruin the cabinet. I must, however, prepare for the worst, and I confidently appeal to the American people for their sympathy and support which they have never withheld from a people struggling for liberty."

Mr. Fitzgerald lost no time to reply to the Irish leader in terms of earnest endorsement and hearty encouragement. He called him the assurance that the league in America would redouble its efforts, and that Ireland is sure of American sympathy and support in the coming crisis. He added the gratifying intelligence that the Nebraska Legislature had on that day, March 20th, by unanimous vote, passed resolutions of sympathy with Ireland, and of condemnation of the Tory coercion policy: "This and similar manifestations throughout a free country," declared Mr. Fitzgerald, "the lie to the slanders of the English press, that true Americans do not sympathize with Ireland. This great liberty-loving people of the United States are entirely in sympathy with Ireland's struggle for Home Rule." John Dillon has summed up Irish feeling and opinions on the bill in his pithy declaration that if he believed the people of England capable of sanctioning the measure he would give up forever the hope of seeing the Irish and English shake hands, if the Irish people would be slaves indeed if they submitted to its iniquitous enactments, adding, that for his own part he would leave a country where no Irishman could live unless he lived like a slave, or if the people were willing he would be proud and happy to lead them in battle. Mr. Gladstone, in perhaps the greatest speech of his life, has branded the bill as the most formidable breach of trust that a popular assembly could perpetrate. Among its most insulting and exasperating proposals, the worst ever submitted to Parliament being the provision that Irish trials should be held in London. Never, said the veteran leader, had he known such a blow at the national feeling of Ireland. Enough, he declared it was, to make one's blood boil to consider the proposals respecting the permanent duration of the bill. To establish what was formerly only a temporary remedy as a permanent rule of existence to society in Ireland was to put a brand of inferiority on that country and forever recognize as a fixed principle that force was a remedy. The lesson of many years, continued Mr. Gladstone, showed that force was no remedy. Ever since the introduction of his Home Rule bill Ireland had been free from crime and outrage—a condition long unknown—but now existing because the Irish people know that the Liberal party as a party had de-

BASE, BLOODY AND BRUTAL.

BASE, BLOODY AND BRUTAL.

clined to abide by them to the last. "If," said Mr. Gladstone, in words of solemn warning and prophetic significance, "the Liberals acceded to the appeals of the government, the result would be a retrogression. The Irish people would return to ask some things which Liberal efforts had already partly remedied. So long as Ireland continued in her present course of moderation, so long would Liberals be bound to persevere in their endeavors to assist her. The time would soon come when to the many now supporting the cause of Ireland would be added many more, when deplorable proposals such as those of the government would be no more associated with the name of Ireland, and when it would be seen that in doing what they could now to serve the Irish cause they were also serving the cause of the wide empire of Great Britain."

We can scarcely believe that the measure of the government will become law, but prepared must we be for the very worst. Our brethren in Ireland who enjoy not the blessings of self-government, and whose hands it is now proposed to tie, look to us who do enjoy the blessings to assist them in their hour of trial. False should we be to freedom and to honor, ays, even to humanity itself, if we refuse to act on their appeal. Of itself Ireland is weak. With fewer than five millions of people she is forced into conflict with the most powerful government in the world. True, she has the sympathy and support of a large portion of the English public, but that sympathy and support, she will not, we must bear it in mind, have, if the Irish throughout the world do not show that in the supreme crisis in this history of their dear motherland they make common cause with her—ready if need there be to shed the very last drop of their blood in resistance to tyranny. The battle must be fought in the main by the children of Ireland in America and Australia. Their influence and their assistance it is that have wrought such a mighty change in British public opinion on the question of Home Rule. Their influence, their assistance, and their endurance it is that will yet, we believe, achieve victory for the cause—the cause of freedom—equality and humanity. With Ronco Canling, the prince of American patriots, does not only every Irishman, and every son of an Irishman in America, but every freeman, whatever his origin, creed or color, declare, in the face of mankind:

"In heart and judgment I am in sympathy with the people of Ireland, and wholly against any and every scheme to trample on their rights. It will be enough if England, the land of Magna Charta, the land of trial by jury and the due process of law, the land of eight centuries of Parliament, the land of Westminster Hall, shall now at this stage of the world turn around and march back towards barbarism. For a Government to uphold itself by force against those who would overthrow it is one thing; this is the right of self-defence; the right to be. But it is a widely different thing to make laws oppressive and repugnant to the great majority of those affected by them and then to violate the principles of government itself in order to enforce such laws. Such a proceeding is not a resort to the right of self-defence nor a resort to any other right. It is might—brutal might. It cannot be defended by the extremity of the occasion; still less by the possession of power great enough to promise impunity to the act. Should the events you apprehend come to pass, Great Britain may raise a home question which mankind may make a question of its own—so deep and universal is the sentiment of liberty."

BASE CALUMNY.

BASE CALUMNY.

Even John Bright, in his fierce hatred of Home Rule for Ireland, is not above resorting to calumny, as the following from the *Mail* of March 22nd establishes: "Mr. John Bright says the majority of the people in Ireland would vote their country to be a State of the American Union, if their leaders instructed them to do so, but that that would be no reason why the British Parliament should." There is no man at all acquainted with Ireland, who does not know, that not alone is there no feeling in Ireland even among the most extreme of those Irishmen who seek for national independence, in favor of making Ireland a state of the American Union, but that any such proposal would be sure to meet with universal and unconquerable opposition from the Irish nation. Ireland feels for America the warmest regard and affection, but Ireland, for very good reasons, has no desire for political connection with the American republic. The Irish are not ignorant of the necessities of their geographical position. They wish to be one with Great Britain, but on terms just to both nations. They know full well that, as things now stand, it were better for the two countries to be wholly disassociated than attempting to live in undivided civil strife. But they, at the same time, recognize that it is in the interests of both, as it is within their reach and capacity, to live in union, peace and harmony. Ireland has indeed a warm feeling for America. She loves her people and admires her institutions. She glories in her history and delights in her success. She remembers with pride that America was once known as the "greater Ireland," and also "St. Brendan's Land," the latter

appella... sixth ce... New Y... masterl... Travell... Nebraska... of Irelan... Easton... little h... showed... E-glish... lands, e... of Ame... immigr... tries, I... triumph... result... borne t... mitte... Washin... of Ame... who for... its glo... the sam... there w... in the... in Wash... recalled... in's vi... disting... mous v... the Iris... fore gr... Irish f... contin... sions fo... warmly... sympath... the in... alone in... did Iris... erica; o... for the... The... aid of... Philade... army at... ings of... mother... of the... some of... can con... blood at... to his f... "Fro... struggl... querable... have b... terrible... slavery... every I... fence o... Irish A... General... friend, ... Mesghe... and hon... country... open ar... their o... homes a... aided o... with a... have, b... the fo... sustain... prestion... you in... their l... Berr... Conserv... ing wh... Comm... sides" ... Ameri... He... patriot... the na... think... acts of... to see... out—... than... whole... given... Ireland... Her... of Iris... of aff... closest... tions... been, f... the I... ering... with... identifi... sacrifi... whose... secure... masse... whose... decreed... featic... of th... these... fidelit... other... becau... ineq... in just... advoc... and... also "St. Brendan's Land," the latter