

The Catholic Weekly Review.

A JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CANADA

Reddite quæ sunt Cæsaris, Cæsari; et quæ sunt Dei, Deo. —Matt 22: 21.

Vol. III

Toronto, Saturday, April 20, 1889.

No. 10

CONTENTS.

NOTES.....	145
CONTRIBUTED ARTICLE.	
From the House of Commons.....	J.K.F. 147
The Romance of a Jesuit.....	146
Cardinal Gibbons on Divorce.....	148
Ireland in London, the House of Parliament.....	149
Archbishop Duhamel.....	150
Holy Week.....	151
The Jesuits' Estates.....	151
EDITORIAL.—	
True Journalism.....	152
The Projected Petition to the Queen.....	152
Ministerial Misconceptions.....	152
The Mail on the Division.....	153
Party, as against Prejudices.....	153
Cardinal Manning on Secular Education.....	153
The Bible in Public Schools.....	154
The Jesuit Settlement.....	155
The Relations of Laval and the Jesuits.....	155
Men and Things.....	157
Canadian Church News.....	157
Catholic and Literary Notes.....	156

Notes.

The extraordinary articles in *Le Canadien* of a week ago, attacking what it termed the "foreign" religious Orders in Canada, have been supplemented by a still more remarkable one in *L'Union Libérale* of Quebec, condemning, in sweeping terms, the "foreign" religious Orders as the authors of all the disputes and difficulties which have arisen between members of the clergy in that Province. Whoever may be most to blame for any unhappy differences that exist in French Canadian ecclesiastical circles, the publication of such articles as those that have appeared in *Le Canadien* and *L'Union Libérale* lately, must be adjudged, in the present temper of public feeling, as wicked and deplorable in the last degree. They constitute a great, and what we fear will prove a wide-reaching, scandal to religion in Canada.

There is always more or less of danger in anonymous writing. An English contemporary, referring to the decision of Rome in favour of Father Lambert in the dispute between him and Bishop McQuade of Rochester, which had its origin in a newspaper controversy, observes that the moral is that if anonymity is once assumed it ought to be maintained to the end. "We have sometimes wondered what might be the result," it says, "when 'Senex' and 'Verax' have been contending with much warmth in our columns, if our correspondents should discover that they both lived under one roof, and that 'Senex' was the parish priest who was being taught a thing or two by 'Verax,' his youngest curate."

An account will be found elsewhere in our pages of the speech of Sir Charles Russell, the counsel for Mr. Parnell, on the re-assembling of the Commission. Perhaps the most pathetic portion of the speech we learn, was that in which he told how the *Times* rejoiced in 1846-7 at the famine which was thinning out the Irish, and brutally insulted the starving scores of thousands who swarmed to the seaports for emigration, likening them to rats who crawled from a drowning ship to a

sound one by a lawser. "I have this consolation, however," continued Sir Charles, quoting Cobden's memorable saying "that any movement could succeed in England, provided it had three things—a good cause, persistent workers, and the hostility of the *Times*."

Sir Charles Russell in showing on Tuesday that if the *Times* had been consistent in nothing else, it had been consistent in its relentless hostility to the Irish people, reminded the Commissioners that the *Times* had vilified the Irish priesthood, calling them "a band of suppleed ruffians," and also recalled the fact that away back in Lord Mulgrave's time it had reproached the *Liberal Viceroy* for daring to invite to dinner "that rancorous, foul mouthed ruffian, O'Connell."

A special correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* referring to Sir Charles Russell's thoughtful and deeply sympathetic statement of his country's unhappy story, on Tuesday last says: Often the sobs came unbidden into his voice as he carried forward the narrative, and still more often the undisguised interest of the Justices and the almost breathless silence of the court room, attested the depth of the impression his sincerity of feeling and his eloquence were making.

The speech of Sir Charles Russell has been by far the most important event of the past week. So far as we can judge from the press comments, it marks a period in the political history of the country. Than the cause which was his to defend, no counsel perhaps, ever had greater. One has to go back for a parallel to Lord Brougham's defence of Queen Caroline, or to Burke's impeachment of Warren Hastings. The *Times*—Tory conspiracy against Mr. Parnell and the Irish Parliamentary party, which amounted, in effect, to a vast Government prosecution, was in reality an attempt to do what Edmund Burke declared had never been successfully done—to draw an indictment against a whole nation. Sir Charles Russell's task before the judges was to clear a whole nation from libel. If Brougham brought to the defence of Queen Caroline an enthusiasm born of belief in her innocence, and Burke to his indictment of Hastings the whole force and feeling of a nature which was stirred to its depths by the story of the sufferings of the Indian population, Sir Charles Russell, we may be sure, was animated by incentives not less deep or dear. The man as well as the politician was aroused within him. The *Weekly Register* of London has well put it: "Himself an Irishman, he has Ireland for his client. A Catholic, he has to expose wrongs inflicted upon his people from hostility to their creed, to trace to that persecution of the past, many a present ill, and perforce to persuade England, if not the Court, that the clergy of Ireland are better spokesmen for its population than the policeman and the informer. As a lover of the British Empire, Sir Charles has the motive of a double patriotism in clearing away the irrelevancies which choke the understanding of the true facts and hopes and fears at issue between England and Ireland."