

The Catholic Record

Published every Friday morning at 422 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, 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 tone and principles; that it will remain, what it has been, thoroughly Catholic, entirely independent of political parties, and exclusively devoted to the cause of the Church and to the promotion of Catholic interests. 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, AUG. 6, 1880.

PRIESTS AND PEOPLE.

The resolutions unanimously adopted at the recent meeting of the Catholic prelates of Ireland merit our heartiest approval. At a time when men of little faith and less principle seek, by insinuation, subterfuge and mendacity, to undermine the attachment subsisting between priests and people—to the honor of the one and the benefit of the other—these resolutions, just given to the world as a solemn declaration of opinion on the social and political status of Ireland, must dispel all doubt—if any doubt were entertained—of the determined attitude of the bishops of Ireland on the pressing necessity of an early solution of the land question. We have repeatedly declared, and we now desire to emphasize our declaration, that no movement was ever set on foot in Ireland for her true political and social advancement that did not enjoy the support and co-operation of the clergy. Extreme caution and prudence have indeed marked the course of the clergy in their alliances with all national movements. Experience proves the wisdom of this caution and the discernment of this prudence. Experience also testifies to the fidelity and endurance of the Irish clergy in upholding the national cause and sustaining the national leaders, when the justice of the cause and the sincerity of the leaders invited their approbation and assistance. From the very first movement for national liberation set on foot by Irish leaders representing the whole nation, till the present day—in every effort set on foot for national emancipation, from the noble undertaking of 1641 till our own times—the Irish priests and prelates have borne their share of the burden and heats of the day. The heroic sacrifice of their own lives has been generously made whenever the interests of religion and country called for such a sacrifice. The names, amongst others, of Heber MacMahon and Oliver Plunkett, whose blood attested their zeal for religion and fatherland, will never, nay, can never be forgotten by the Irish race. During the long night of the penal times the Irish clergy, by heroic devotedness and unexampled self-sacrifice, upheld the faith of the people by sharing their sorrows, their trials and their social and political degradation. Do we want historical proof in support of our allegations? When the perfidy of the first of the Stuarts disappointed the just hopes of Catholic Ireland, robbed of her altars and despoiled of her freedom by the minions of the blood-thirsty Elizabeth, Ireland languished in gloomy despair till the advent of her son and successor, under whose reign a vigorous and gallant effort was made to recover her lost liberties and re-establish her ancient worship. From the very inception of this movement the Catholic prelate of Ireland lent it assistance, approval and support. To the Irish bishops, indeed, is due the credit of having given the movement shape and organization. On the 22nd of March, 1642, the bishops of the Province of Armagh, in Provincial Synod, besides declaring the war undertaken by the Irish people for these purposes just and lawful,

invited a National Synod to meet on the 10th of May following, at Kilkenny.

"On that day accordingly," says McGee, "all the prelates then in the country, with the exception of Bishop Dease, met at Kilkenny. There were present O'Reilly, Archbishop of Armagh; Butler, Archbishop of Cashel; O'Kealy, Archbishop of Tuam; David Roche, the venerable Bishop of Ossory; the Bishops of Clonfert, Elphin, Waterford, Lismore, Kildare, Down and Connor; the proctors of Dublin, Limerick and Killaloe, with sixteen other dignitaries and heads of religious orders—in all twenty-nine prelates and superiors, or their representatives.

"The Synod of Kilkenny proceeded with the utmost solemnity and anxiety to consider the circumstances of their own and the neighboring kingdoms. No equal number of men could have been found in Ireland, at that day, with an equal amount of knowledge of foreign and domestic politics.

"As the most popular tribunal, invested with the highest moral power in the kingdom, it was their arduous task to establish order and authority among the chaotic elements of the revolution. By the admission of those most opposed to them, they conducted their deliberations, for nearly three weeks, with equal prudence and energy."

The war thus entered on by the Catholic Irish, under the authority of their bishop, with the approval and co-operation of the Holy See, ended after nine years of hostilities in the total overthrow of the national cause. In the time which followed the triumph of Cromwell, the Irish clergy suffered with their devoted flocks every cruelty that fanaticism could devise.

"The ecclesiastics," says the same historian whom we first cited, "never, in any instance, were allowed to escape. Among those who suffered death during the short space of the Protectorate, are counted three bishops and three hundred ecclesiastics."

So it was nearly half a century later when Ireland, by its devotion to an unworthy prince, brought on itself the faithless cruelty of the Protestant revolutionists who had placed the Prince of Orange on the throne. When her brave soldiers withdrew to the service of France, Ireland saw her clergy banished in hundreds to foreign lands. Seven years after the treaty of Limerick "there remained," we are assured by McGee, "but 400 secular and 800 regular clergy in the country. Nearly double that number departed by threats or violence, were scattered over Europe, pensioners on the princes and bishops of their faith or the institutions of their order. In Rome 72,000 francs annually were allotted for the maintenance of the fugitive Irish clergy, and during the first three months of 1699, these remittances from the Holy Father, amounting to 90,000 livres, were placed in the hands of the Nuncio at Paris for the temporary relief of the fugitives in France and Flanders. It may also be added here that till the end of the eighteenth century, an annual charge of 1,000 Roman crowns was borne by the Papal treasury for the encouragement of Catholic poor schools in Ireland." Why this merciless severity, exercised by the English Government and its agents in Ireland, towards the Catholic priesthood? Because they knew that the priests, as custodians of Irish traditions, and keepers of Irish faith, were the highest and noblest embodiment of Irish national autonomy. They knew that from them injustice, rapacity and cruelty would meet the sternest opposition, and as their whole course, in regard to Ireland, was one of injustice, rapacity and cruelty, the clergy had to be removed to render its execution easy and successful. The rebellion of 1798 did not, it is true, meet with favor on the part of the Irish clergy, but the reason is evident. That rebellion was organized in great measure by men professing the principles of the French revolutionists. But though unable to give approval to the principles underlying the organization of the rebellion, the Irish clergy recognized too well the effects of the heartless tyranny of English misgovernment to misapprehend the sincerity of the motives of the brave men who, in that gallant struggle, fought for Irish freedom.

In the struggle for Catholic emancipation, the Catholic prelates of Ireland, rejecting the proffered alliance between Church and State contained in the "Veto" scheme, so dear to British statesmen and half-hearted Catholics, joined hands with the people in demanding such a full and unrestricted concession of freedom as would leave the Church un-

fettered by the domination of an alien and heretical government. The resolutions adopted by the assembled prelates in 1815 are an explicit and emphatic repudiation of any such domination. Amongst them we find the following:

"That it is our decided and conscientious conviction, that any power granted to the Crown of Great Britain, of interfering directly or indirectly in the appointment of bishops for the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, must essentially injure and may eventually subvert the Roman Catholic religion in this country.

"That, with this conviction deeply and unalterably fixed in our minds, we should consider ourselves as betraying the dearest interests of that portion of the Church which the Holy Ghost has committed to our care, did we not declare most unequivocally, that we will, at all times and under all circumstances, deprecate and oppose, in every canonical and constitutional way, any such interference?"

Since the achievement of Catholic emancipation on terms honorable to the Catholic body, the bishops and clergy of Ireland have given countenance and support to every movement of national regeneration not based on conspiracy and treason. Both in pastoral letters and political papers, the bishops and priests of Ireland have, during the last half century, contributed moderation, truth, erudition and dignity, to the discussion of the condition and rights of Ireland. In the repeal agitation, the ecclesiastical titles commotion, and the disestablishment movement, the clergy stood firmly by the national cause.

On the land question the patriotism of some of the Irish prelates has been questioned. The resolutions adopted, with the heartiest unanimity, at their recent annual meeting set forth their views—views worthy of the grand old Church, whose traditions the bishops so nobly sustain.

The first resolution contains a severe but just condemnation of the executive for its criminal neglect of warnings addressed in due time to prevent the distress now afflicting Ireland:

1. "That we deem it our duty to express our heartfelt gratitude to the generous friends who, in every part of the world, came to the assistance of our afflicted people in their dire distress. We regret that our appeal to the Executive last autumn for work for our laboring classes to avert the threatened famine was not attended to, and that we were forced to have recourse to the charity of Christendom to save our country from the horrors of famine."

The second resolution reaffirms the declaration of the bishops in 1879, concerning the pressing necessity of immediate legislation to set the land question at rest. The third is as follows:

3. "That, in the present severe crisis of the country, we desire to convey our special sympathy to the farming classes; and we exhort all those who have at heart the best interests of Ireland to use their influence with our Parliamentary friends towards remedying the manifold injustice of the laws which regulate the sale and tenure of land in this kingdom, and which have so long fettered and depressed the energies of our people."

The fourth resolution offers a severe rebuke to heartless landlords, who, in this crisis, seem delighted on showing forth their cruelty to the world:

4. "That we deplore, more than words can express, the unchristian feeling displayed by some of our landlords of this kingdom during this period of destitution in their dealings with their suffering tenants."

The fifth is one of solemn but affectionate warning:

5. "That we deem it our duty also to warn our devoted flock against allowing themselves to be drawn by their sufferings or necessities to the employment of unjust or illegal remedies; and we exhort them to be on their guard against such principles and projects as are contrary to the teachings of religion and justice."

These resolutions, the last public manifesto of the Irish bishops, should set at rest forever amongst Catholics any doubt of the patriotism of the Irish clergy and any misconception of their devotedness to Irish popular interests.

We look upon the union of priests and people in any Irish agitation as its most hopeful feature. Ireland is essentially a Catholic nation, and its Catholicity shines forth never so brightly as when the masses of its people move in accord with the authoritative voice of their devoted, patriotic pastors.

Dr. Tanner has decreased two inches in height, owing, it is said, to the shrinkage of the layers of cartilage between the bones of the vertebral column. When he began his fast he measured 5 feet 3 1/2 inches, and he now measures only 5 feet 3 1/4 inches. A St. Paul, Minn., despatch speaking of him says: "He has a divorced wife in Minnesota, who left him because he tried to enforce his ascetic theories on her. Dr. Tanner would make a most excellent tenant for the Irish landlord."

THE IRISH BOROUGH FRANCHISE BILL.

The government has decided to drop the Irish Borough Franchise Bill—a measure of justice to which the Liberal party is long since pledged. The franchise in Ireland is so restricted, especially in towns and cities, that it cannot be truly said that the people are invested with the right of choosing representatives. A mere fragment of the population is endowed with a right belonging to every citizen. In England and Scotland the franchise in boroughs has been so extended as to embrace every class of the population qualified to vote, but in Ireland it is quite different. The number of legally qualified electors in that country is very limited indeed. The result is that in several cities and towns members are frequently elected to Parliament whose principles are odious to the people. Mr. Gladstone pledged himself, at the beginning of the session, to a removal of this glaring abuse. To Ireland he would certainly be doing a great service in assimilating its borough franchise to that of Great Britain. The non-electors in many of the Irish boroughs are, if anything, better qualified for enfranchisement than many of the actual electors in British towns and boroughs. We regret that the Premier has seen fit to postpone action in a matter of such importance, and we do sincerely hope that another session may not pass away without witnessing this substantial act of justice accomplished in the interests of Ireland and the whole empire.

DEMOCRATIC LEGISLATION.

No one can view the recent proceedings in the British Parliament without coming to the conclusion that a struggle between the people and the landholders is at hand. The legislation proposed by Mr. Gladstone on the Land question in Ireland, and the "hazes and rabbits" bill promoted by his government, small as are the concessions they make to just popular demands, have given umbrage to landholders, both Whig and Tory. The lords will, no doubt, throw out these measures, and thus bring the two Houses of Parliament into conflict. The landlord influence in the Commons is, we must confess, greater than, in our opinion, it ought to be, but great as it is even in the Lower Chamber, there is also a still more powerful, if less numerous party—we mean the Radicals—returned by so many important constituencies at the last election. Opposition from the lords will but nerve this party to determination and boldness in demanding reforms of the most advanced type. The condition of the masses of the people in the three kingdoms calls for the interposition of the master hand of a great statesman to raise them, from a degradation truly barbarous, to a status worthy our civilization. The aristocratic system has driven the working classes into a violent hatred of monarchy. The titled landowners and prince-favored plutocrats, intent upon their own aggrandizement only, join hands to oppose reform and resist progress. The consequence is evident. The people are degraded and unhappy. Honest and patriotic men deplore their inattention, cruel and indefensible, of the government to the just demands of the artisan and agricultural classes. It is from these classes that the government draws its army— from these it derives its revenue— upon these rest its happiness and security. Yet, by the selfish policy of a bloated nobility, they are treated as aliens in their own country, and when they demand social and political disenfranchisement, denounced as traitors and enemies of the State. We are not friendly to revolution—we hold in horror the abominable tenets of Communism—but we are not the less desirous of the regeneration of the masses of the people in the British Isles, and we have no hesitation in expressing our fear that it will be only at the point of the bayonet that the people will enforce compliance with their demands and secure the realization of their expectations. The aristocratic elements have, in their opposition to the Irish compensation bill—a mere paltry measure of justice to Ireland—shown

a determined disposition to thwart any scheme of social amelioration, however limited. They may, by their votes in the Lords' Chamber, defeat the scheme propounded by Mr. Gladstone. They may, indeed, for some brief time, arrest the advancement of all proposed popular reforms, but their success can only be temporary. History proves that whenever and wherever the aristocratic and democratic elements came into violent contact, the former was forced to give way. So it will be in the coming contest between the lords and people in Great Britain. The latter will triumph. We hope that their triumph may not be achieved through civil war and its attendant horrors. But the longer the reforms required by the people are delayed, the greater the danger that when they are achieved it will be in the upheaval of thrones and the total abolition of the aristocratic elements from the constitution.

ANOTHER AFGHAN WAR.

Britain has to deplore another Afghan disaster. The policy of the British Government in withdrawing its forces from Cabul and strengthening its position at Candahar, propounded in the House of Commons by the Marquis of Hartington, had just elicited approval from Parliament and the nation at large, when the news of the annihilation of Gen. Burrow's brigade at Simla threw the people into a frenzy of horror banishing all idea of pacification, till Yahoob Khan—the great mischief maker—believed to be acting in the interests of Russia, should be crushed out. The design of Yahoob Khan is manifestly the reduction of Candahar. This city is second only in importance in Afghanistan to Cabul and Herat. It is 275 miles south-west of the former, and to the British Government is, therefore, a point of strategical importance of no ordinary value. The forces of Yahoob Khan numbers 12,000 men—a formidable force, indeed. The British garrison at Candahar cannot exceed 2,000 men. If this small force can hold its own against the enemy till the arrival of reinforcements, the designs of the disappointed ex-Ameer will be frustrated. But there is no concealing the fact that the sympathy of the Afghan tribes is with the ex-Ameer. British occupation of Afghanistan is certainly not popular with the people of the country. They dread subjection to British rule and are stimulated to action by a remembrance of Gen. Robert's severity last year at Cabul, as well as by a determination to maintain their independence of British control. No Ameer nominated or sustained by Britain can expect the support of the Afghan tribes. But, however impolitic the course of the British Government may have been in entering on the occupation of Afghanistan, British prestige now imperatively demands the maintenance of British power, at least at Candahar. Yahoob Khan is, no doubt, determined to fight to the last. To subdue him, as the British are in honor bound to do, may be a task of greater magnitude than British Ministers realize. It may require more than one campaign in the cheerless gorges of Afghanistan to teach Yahoob Khan and his followers that Britain is not insulted with impunity. But, however disinclined to wage war in Afghanistan, the government of Mr. Gladstone is bound in honor to maintain hostilities till a wholesome dread of British prowess be driven into the unruly Afghans.

THE OKA INDIANS.

A Montreal correspondent of the *Globe* finds fault with Attorney-Gen. Loranger, of Quebec, for deciding on another prosecution of the Oka Indian incendiaries. The writer talks of persecution in this case. There is no persecution whatsoever. These Indians are charged with a most heinous crime. The evidence against them is strong, and was convincing. The juries at St. Scholastique and Aylmer did not, it is true, acquit except in one case any of the Indians brought up for trial, but everyone knows that in the districts where the trials have been held the Protestant population has been driven by inflammatory appeals from the pulpit and through the press, to look upon these unfortunate people as martyrs in the cause of religious liberty. The same kind of the door of the Indians and

from which they have not yet been able to exculpate themselves, is so serious that the Attorney-General were not doing his manifest duty if he did not exhaust every means in bringing the culprits to justice. Judge Bourgeois, before whom the last trials took place, is a gentleman of the highest legal attainments, and in every qualification honorable in the judicial office a credit to the judiciary of the Dominion. From him, and indeed from any of the other judges of Lower Canada, the Indians have nothing to fear on the score of justice. A little of the money now foolishly spent by Protestant societies in fomenting hostilities between the Indians and the seminary, if expended in encouraging habits of industry amongst the unfortunate Aborigines, could not fail of a beneficial effect. The Attorney-General of Quebec does honor to his office by refusing to be brow-beaten by fanatical scribblers, in ordering the furtherance of the ends of justice by a new prosecution.

THE PRESIDENTIAL CONTEST.

The contest amongst our republican neighbors for the high office of President has opened with much less activity and excitement than is usual on such occasions. The New York city Democrats have indeed held an immense ratification meeting, with Mr. Tilden as chairman, but the assurance of victory already felt by the Democracy deprives the contest in its early stages of the excitement attendant upon uncertainty. The fight will, notwithstanding the present seeming inactivity of the politicians, be very bitter. Unless the republican managers spring a mine and be enabled to do that which they did in 1877—count in a candidate rejected by the votes of the people, and by the suffrages of the electoral colleges—we cannot see anything in the way of Democratic success. The dread of losing power after its enjoyment for twenty years will nerve the Republicans to battle with all their energy, perhaps the energy of despair. Their party has ruled the country for the greater part of that time with almost absolute power. President Johnson, during his accidental incumbency of the executive, endeavored, but vainly, to checkmate the Republican leaders in the two houses of Congress. He saw his own policy concerning the readmission of the southern states to the union, a policy just, wise and far-reaching, contradicted and overturned by immense majorities in both Chambers. Bills providing for reconstruction, through military occupation and negro enfranchisement, were carried through the Senate and House by two-third votes over his veto. And he himself escaped impeachment only through the patriotic independence of a party of a few honest republican senators. The House elected in Nov., 1876, was very largely Democratic, but the Senate was at that time still republican, so that it may be truly said that since 1860 the federal government has been in the hands and under the control of the Republican party. They will now be judged by their record. A new generation of electors has sprung into being since the war. The American people are now anxious to fill in the chasm caused by that great social convulsion. They have had enough of the hatred and animosity, enough of the treason and wickedness engendered by the criminality of professional politicians. They feel that if the great American nation is to hold its present high place in the world's esteem and affection, they believe that if the generations yet to come to inhabit the magnificent country America calls its own, are to enjoy the priceless benefit of liberty and solid constitutional government, it cannot be through the perpetuation of animosity and rivalry between north and south, but by the abolition of every remembrance of the civil discord which has so long divided state and state, section and section. If the south to-day presents a solid and unbroken front in support of the Democratic party, it is largely, if not wholly, due to the insane policy pursued for years by the Republican leaders, that of endeavoring to place the newly-enfranchised slaves in a position of lasting political supremacy over their late masters. In the framing of new state constitutions for the southern states after the war, a step deemed necessary by Congress, the white population was everywhere excluded by harsh, shortsighted and insulting restriction from the right of voting for delegates to the convention entrusted with the laying of the foundation of the civil and political structures raised upon the ruins of invasion and war. What was the consequence? The delegates chosen to do this great duty, to rebuild that which the republicans claimed to have been destroyed, to secure lasting peace, equality and security for the rights of property, were either ignorant blacks or worthless white adventurers from the north.

The negro element in the Convention was necessarily under the control of the latter, whose purposes were best served by a perpetration of the galling memories of the war. But the forms of free government employed with determination by the white population, to whom a great part of the negroes remained attached by ties of the deepest affection, soon brought about the downfall of the carpet-bag ascendancy. Defeated at the polls, the radical adventurists in the same states, resorted to violence