

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE,
Editor.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,
Business Manager.

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.
Messrs. LUKK KING and JOHN NICH are
solely authorized to receive subscriptions
and transact all other business for the
CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agents for Alexandria, Glenneville and
Leamington—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Advertisements—Ten cents per line
each insertion.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and
recommended by the Archbishop of St.
Boniface, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton,
Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Cath-
olic 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.

Articles must be paid in full before the
paper can be stopped.

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

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

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., July 27th, 1889.

THE AGITATION AND AN-
NEXATION.

The Mail has been taunting the Lower
Canadians that should they desire to
escape from being taxed and persecuted
by the rampant fanatics of Ontario by
inviting the Americans to take possession
of the Province, they would be no better
off than they are now; or, rather, than
they would be under the benign sway
which J. L. Hughes, his brother Sam, of
Indiana, and the Mail would exercise
over them, if they could. It quotes one
of the Chicago papers to the same effect
—that they should lay aside their medi-
cine and language if the Province of
Quebec should become a sovereign state.
But the Mail altogether ignores the fact,
which indeed it has all along misrep-
resented, that medievalism is not so dear
to the French Canadians as they might
think. If they have so much of it that
they would be the case. As to their
language, though they are much attached
to it, and a noble language it must be
acknowledged to be, we imagine that if
they found it necessary to adopt English,
they would do so gradually without com-
pulsion, and entirely of their own accord,
in course of time, just as the State of
Louisiana has done. But this is not the
difficulty. The Ontario fanatics wish to
deprive them of their autonomy. They
desire to rule them from Toronto, and to
govern them. This is what they will
not submit to, and if Quebec became a
sovereign state, it would preserve its
autonomy and make its own laws, just as
every state in the Union does. This the
Mail knows very well, but it would not
suit its purpose to admit it. There would
be no interference with their teaching
French in their schools, as long as it might
remain the language of the state, and if
they wished to make provision for a
higher education by a Jesuit Estate Act,
or in any other way, not a state in the
Union would interfere with them.

The Mail's course on many occasions
has given reason to the public to suspect
that "business considerations" induce it
to work in the interests of the United
States, and as it must be evident to all
that the present anti-Catholic and anti-
French agitation must, if even partially
successful, result in breaking up Confed-
eration, and probably ultimately in annex-
ation, there is little room for doubt that
it has been excited just for this purpose.

The introduction of the question of
annexation into the discussion makes this
point perfectly clear. Every one is satis-
fied that the United States would welcome
one or more of the Canadian provinces
into the Union, and nothing can be con-
sidered which would tend more surely to
bring about such a result than what the
Mail is doing—the exciting of race against
race and creed against creed. Moreover,
if Quebec could only be induced to look
for annexation, and should succeed, it is
very natural to suppose that other pro-
vinces of the Dominion would soon follow.
We have no doubt at all that many of the
agitators have this object in view. It is
perfectly well known that some of the
thirteen members of Parliament who
voted for disallowance of the Jesuits'
Estate Act think more of the interests of
the United States than of those of Can-
ada; and one at least is actually an
American, with strong sympathies for the
United States. Such men would very
naturally seize upon the opportunity of
exciting discord between the provinces,
with the hope that the United States
will profit thereby—and the Mail has un-
consciously let it out that this is its object
also.

We do not imagine for a moment that
this is the object of all who took part in
the Toronto No Popery Convention, but
that the leading spirits had this in view
seems beyond a doubt. Those of whom
had not such a purpose are cat-paws, of who
they make use to take the nut out of the
fire.

The Montreal Star, too, seems to have a
suspicion that this is the case, though Mr.
Graham, the proprietor, is himself one of
the cat-paws. A late issue of the Star
said:

"If there are those among the agitators
who would welcome the annexation of
Quebec to the United States, let them not
forget that as a state of the Union Quebec

would exercise greater autonomous pow-
ers than she does as a province of Canada,
and let them determine whether the Pro-
testant minority have anything to gain in
that direction. We have no sympathy
with the Protestants who want to emi-
grate and leave Quebec behind them, nor
with the Protestants who want to go to
the United States and take Quebec with
them. We believe the English speaking
people are here to stay, and the Union
Jack is here to stay, and we believe that
the good common sense of the greater,
wiser and more influential part of the
Protestant community is opposed to the
ill-considered and suicidal movement
which threatens to imperil British inter-
ests in Canada."

GOADING AN IRRITATED
PEOPLE.

Mr. Balfour has succeeded in irritating
more than ever the people of Wexford by
prosecuting the venerable parish priest of
Ramsgrange, the Very Rev. Canon Doyle,
and his curate, Rev. Father Brown, together
with about twenty people of the district,
the charges being membership in the
National League and conspiracy to pre-
vent Colonel Tottenham's tenants not to
pay their rent. Indignation meetings at
which vast crowds assembled were held in
all parts of the county, at which the
course of the Government was condemned
in the most forcible language.

The defendants were summoned to
appear on Thursday, 27th ult., before a
Circuit Court at Athlone, but they
treated the summons with contempt and
none put in an appearance, nor had they
any one to represent them. The crown
prosecutor was baffled by the fact that
he had no witnesses, but he procured
an adjournment in the absence of the
defendants. Indignation meetings were
held at Wexford town, Inish-
corthy, New Ross, Ramsgrange, Campile,
and several other places, at which the
prosecution was denounced as "cowardly
and insane." At Enniscorthy, Mr.
William Redmond, M. P., was the prin-
cipal speaker. He declared that if
violence resulted from the conduct of the
Government, the responsibility would
rest upon them for so irritating the
people.

At Wexford, the crowd which assem-
bled was the largest which has been
brought together for years, for though
the notice was very short, popular feeling
was thoroughly aroused. Mr. Devereux,
Mayor of Wexford, presided, and the
meeting was addressed by several of the
most prominent citizens, including Cap-
tain Maigne, T. C., and the parish priest,
Rev. P. Doyle, Dr. Counsel, and Mr. Wm.
Redmond, M. P.

Mr. Healy, M. P., also addressed the
meeting. He declared that this last act of
Mr. Balfour demonstrated the utter
stupidity and folly of his coercion policy.
He said that suppressed branches of the
League are more trouble to the Govern-
ment than the branches that are tolerated,
and this prosecution proves the utter
failure of coercion policy.

Under coercion law, it is true, a person
may be condemned to six months' impris-
onment for putting in an appearance at,
or in any way encouraging a meeting of
the League, and he may be subjected
to all the indignities and cruelties which
were inflicted upon Mr. Wm. O'Brien,
and poor John Mandeville in Tullamore,
but Canon Doyle and his fellow defend-
ants have done nothing which they can
prosecute themselves, and by prosecut-
ing them under a tyrannical law which
is more honored in the breach than in the
observance, the Government simply
render themselves more odious than ever
in the eyes of the people. By these pro-
ceedings they are filling up the cup of
their iniquities; and making more sure
their utter condemnation at the next
election. It is believed, even, on good
grounds that they will not secure evi-
dence enough to convict, though very slight
evidence is all that is required for this in
Ireland, with a bench of magistrates
obsequious enough to do the Govern-
ment's bidding on all occasions. Still
even such magistrates can scarcely find the
defendants guilty unless they have some-
thing proved against them. Should the
prosecution fail, the Government will be
subjected to the ignominy of defeat, as
they will in any case incur the obloquy
of tyranny.

Mr. Healy, in concluding his eloquent
speech, called upon the farmers and laborers
to emulate the conduct of their great priest,
Canon Doyle, in taking part with the
oppressed. He asked the clergy of Ireland
to follow his noble example, and exhorted
the whole people of the country to stand
firmly with one another, and thus the
whole hateful and rotten system which
had left the skulls of poor, naked and hun-
gry beings to whiten in death, would go
down in the whirlwind of indignation
which its infamies produce from one end
of Ireland to the other.

While Archbishop Colley, was preach-
ing in London recently he spoke rather
unkindly of the devil. Recollecting
himself in the midst of his fervor, and
recalling the motto that the devil is not
so black as he is painted, he replied to
the fancied remonstrances of those who
would ask him to give the devil his due.
"Ah my friends," he exclaimed, "if we
give the devil his due, many of us would
be missing."

"COME JOIN US, OR WE
PERISH."

The Protestant Education Committee of
the Province of Quebec accepted without
protest the grant of \$800,000 apportioned
by the Legislature for Protestant education,
at the very time that Ontario was being
excited by agitators from end to end, thus
virtually declaring their conviction that
full justice had been done to the Protest-
ant population by the Jesuits' Estate
Act. It was not necessary, however, that
for the Act passed by unanimous vote,
in the Legislature, even the twelve Pro-
testant members thereof supporting it in
the name of the Protestant population of
Quebec. To the anti-Catholic agitators
all this was a severe blow, for it is to be
supposed that the Protestants of Quebec
are better judges than the Ontario parsons
and Orange lodges, when justice is done
to them. They ought to know this them-
selves without having to be told by
Ontario Protestants that they are a mis-
guided people. It was not until Ontario
parsons proclaimed from the house-tops
that any Quebec Protestants were at
all aware how grievously they had
been wronged, but even all that has
been done by the fiery resolutions
passed on the subject in this Province
has not stirred the Protestant body of
Quebec to feel that the injury has been
done to them which the Ontario bogus
Equal Rights Association have published
with such a flourish of tomahawks and
warlike speeches. A few Protestants of
Montreal, not at all comprising the re-
sponsible commercial firms and other
representative men, were, indeed, induced
by W. H. Howland, Henry O'Brien and
other Toronto demagogues to echo the
indignant denunciations of Western big-
otry, but the great bulk of the Protestant
population refuse to stir in the matter.

The Anglican Synod of Montreal did
pass fiery resolutions condemning the
Estate Act, but, even in that assembly,
controlled by the Protestant parsons,
there was a strong minority which refused
to be led by the nose to join in the
fanatical outcry. The vote stood seven-
ty-two to twenty-two for the protest; but
every one knows that in a political issue
the synod cannot control even members
of the Church of England. Still less
will it have any effect upon the great
bulk of the Protestant population. A
fact which is well known to the
Ontario bigots is that they will not succeed
in arousing the Quebec Protestants to side
with them in their bigotry, and this
knowledge is one of the things which tend
to make them frantic. We are assured by
influential journals in British Columbia
that they will not move that Province
either, and we have good reason to believe
that their efforts will be equally futile as
regards the rest of the Dominion. Cer-
tainly should they succeed in gaining
Ontario, which is not at all sure.

It is the desperation which arises from
this prospect of a contemptuous reception
of their bigotry from the Protestant
people of the other Provinces, that induces
the Montreal Witness to make a frantic
appeal to the Protestant Education Com-
mittee of that Province to join in the
parsons' protest: but the Witness pos-
sesses very little influence in Quebec, out-
side of a very narrow circle of extreme
fanatics, and we are sure the Protestant
Education Committee will treat the
Witness' advice with the contempt it
deserves. But should the Protestant
Committee be bulled into joining the
fanatics, it will be no reason why the
Quebec Government should not carry out
the other provisions of the Estate Act.
The compensation to the Jesuits
would, in that event, be more
really a restitution than it is
now. It will be noticed that the Witness
considers the amount apportioned to Pro-
testants education small and insignificant;
still it is quite equal to the \$800,000 ap-
portioned to the Jesuits and the Bishops,
the ratio of the two populations being
taken into account; yet one of the great-
est objections to the last mentioned out-
lay is that it is too large a sum for its pur-
pose. It would seem that the Witness
thinks that at least seven times the amount
should be given for the education of a
Protestant child that is devoted to the
education of one Catholic. If this were
done, the Witness perhaps would be satis-
fied.

The following is an extract from the
article of the Witness, which is a curiosity
in its way:

"The committee should on every ground
be upheld by their constituents, the Pro-
testant people of this Province, in declin-
ing the \$800,000. Mr. Mercer seems to
be anxious to compel the committee to
accept his proposal. Does he fear that
without their acceptance the Protestant
Committee will have a legal claim upon
the Government for a full share of the
whole value of the Jesuit estates if
they are disposed of without the consent
of the committee? As has been pointed
out before, the settlement would be
a bad one for the committee and a
worse one still for the educational inter-
ests of this Province, as a whole. If the
Jesuit Estate Act is disallowed, there
will be in trust for educational purposes
for this Province property valued at
from one to two millions of dollars. If
the Jesuit Estate Act goes into force
there will of this fund remain the inter-
est upon \$800,000 for educational pur-

poses, and that only at the pleasure of
the Lieutenant Governor in Council, or,
in other words, as long as a Chapleau or a
Mercier Government chooses to pay it.
The \$800,000 paid down in a lump sum,
according to the commands of the Pope,
will be diverted from educational purposes
to ecclesiastical purposes. Protestants
should oppose the diversion on two
grounds, the first being that the State
should endow no Church for ecclesiastical
purposes, and second the education of
the majority of this Province is a matter
of the first importance to the State, there-
fore to the minority. They should, there-
fore, uphold the committee in demanding
the restoration of the trust, and the com-
mittee are only acting in the obvious in-
terests of their constituents by declining
to agree to a breach of trust, whereby a
great fund will be diverted from educa-
tional purposes, and whereby the claim
of Protestants to their share of a large
fund will be compromised, in order to
secure a comparatively small and unguar-
anteed annual payment."

A WAR OF CREEDS.

Mr. George Lovatt, of Sword street,
Toronto, undertook, on Sunday evening,
the 14th July, to distribute to the con-
gregation of St. Matthews' Church in that
city a number of tracts on Ritualism,
and at the same time some other gentle-
men distributed similar tracts at other
church doors on the same subject. The
tracts distributed were entitled "Ritual-
ism: is it lawful?" The rector, Rev.
Scott Howard, appeared before a large
number were circulated and endeavored
to prevent the distribution. This he
effected by a stratagem. He told Mr.
Lovatt to move on, and then, under
cover of the darkness, making a dash
upon the objectionable literature, he
captured all the remaining stock. He
followed the rector, gaining upon him
rapidly, and just as the latter thought
himself secure dealt him a blow which
made him accelerate his speed.

Mr. Lovatt is publisher of the tracts in
question, the object of which is to create
a sentiment against the doctrines which
are nowadays under the name of High
Churchism or Ritualism, taught to
many members of the Church of Eng-
land.

The style and object of Mr. Lovatt's
tracts will be understood by the fol-
lowing extract:

"A strong Protestant feeling has very
properly been aroused throughout this
Dominion by the Jesuits' Estate Bill,
which we trust will not die out until it
has accomplished its object in preventing
the growth of Popery at the expense of
the taxpayer.

"It is high time Protestants were
aroused to activity, not only by encroach-
ments on their rights, but by the abuse
of privileges conferred on the Roman
Catholics, which have been going on for
some years whilst Protestants slumbered
and slept.

"But the doings of the Jesuits in Quebec
are a very small fraction of the mischief
the Jesuits, the Ritualists are doing in
the Church of England! It has often
been asked of late 'is there an AUTHORITY
in the Church of England to prevent these
Roman innovations? Are these Ritualists
continually introducing into the Church
Services, are they Legal?' We say no;
 emphatically No! they are not NO
LEGAL: and we purpose to show
through these Tracts that the multitude
of these Roman innovations, Doctrines,
Ceremonies, Practices, Postures, Preces,
Incense, Vestments, Confessionals,
Phylacteries, Genitricutions, Intonations,
Abolutions, Altars, Candles, Crosses, etc.,
etc., which the Ritualists are introduc-
ing are entirely Foreign to the Good Old
Protestant Church of England, and are
directly copied from the Church of Rome,
have been declared Unlawful by the
Highest Courts of Law in the Empire,
and are contrary to the CANONS and
RESOLUTIONS of the Provincial Synod;
and also that it is the avowed intention
of the Ritualists to Unprotestantise the
Church of England and assimilate her
services to the Church of Rome."

Mr. Lovatt has been for some weeks
engaged in the distribution of this and
other tracts of the same kind, to the
great annoyance of Rev. Mr. Howard
and other rectors of churches which have
been the scene of the tract distribution.
Mr. Lovatt himself says that he has been
badly treated, but he avows that he
at all events he thought he was a match
for all his assailants, and that he gave
the clergyman who was his assailant
"two hard clouts on the neck." He
thought that for a time, when the con-
gregation surrounded him calling for
vengeance because he had struck the
minister, his life was in danger. These
Ritualistic or anti-Ritualistic encounters
which have become so frequent in the
English Church, of late, lead us to the
conviction that the Church of England
would do well to reform itself
before undertaking to reform all
Christendom. It is scarcely fair for
members of that Church to make profes-
sion that Catholics or Jesuits are respon-
sible for all their diversities of opinion.
Protestantism is itself responsible for
its own internal divisions. They are the
result of its own palmary principle
which sets up individual judgment as
the sole arbiter of all differences of belief,
and it is one of the evidences of the
weakness of its cause, that, instead of
acknowledging the consequences of its
own principles, it endeavors, like Mr.
Lovatt's tracts, to throw all the respon-
sibility on the Catholic Church, which
has not caused the diversities of Protes-
tantism, and which does not uphold
them or defend them in any form.

MORE WHITECHAPEL MUR-
DERS.

There has been another dreadful murder
committed in Whitechapel, and the deed
is again supposed to be the work of Jack
the Ripper. Letters have been written
to the police, stating that he would re-
commence the work of death in July, and
on the 17th inst., the eighth victim of this
assassin was killed almost in the very
presence of the police. A constable left
the spot ten minutes before, and on his
return he found the mutilated body in
Castle Alley. He started at once in
search of the assassin, but only discovered
Isaac Lewis Jacobs, who had been sent by
his brother on an errand for cheese and
pickles. The woman who was murdered
could not have uttered a cry without be-
ing heard by the police, who were within
a short distance from the spot where she
was killed. She was evidently taken un-
awares. She was a strongly built woman,
weighing one hundred and forty pounds.
The work had been done with a dull
knife. There was one cut four inches
long on the groin, and another in the
neck. There were twenty scratches which
would have been slashes if the knife had
been sharp. The murdered woman was
identified as Alice Mackenzie, a
charming woman of low character. The
murderer evidently knew the locality well
and the ways by which he could escape
to Whitechapel road, a very public thor-
oughfare close by the place of the mur-
der. The police have no clue whatsoever
for his discovery. Jacobs, who was found
near the place immediately after, was at
once released after a short detention, as he
was evidently innocent. Three other men
were arrested but were also released.

The murders of last year which were
committed in Whitechapel by a Jack the
Ripper, as the diabolical perpetrator is
called, commenced on April 3rd, when the
first took place. The next two were in
August, three occurred in September and
the last one in November. There were
two others supposed also to have been
committed by the same unknown: one at
Gateshead in September, near Newcastle-
on-Tyne, and one on the Thames embank-
ment in October. It will be remembered
that there was then a general outcry
against the police on account of their in-
efficiency, which resulted in the resignation
of Gen. Williams the chief. Unless the
perpetrator of the present outrage be dis-
covered, the people will lose all confidence
in their ability to do their work. The
police are expected to be so well ac-
quainted with criminal localities and per-
sons as to be able at once, almost, to lay
their hands upon guilty parties, and if
they fail, the public become very much
disappointed.

If such crimes had occurred in Ire-
land, there would be some excuse for the
outcry which has been raised by the
Tories in regard to the woful condition
of that country, but with the fact staring
them in the face that amid all her suffer-
ings, Ireland still retains her character
as a country free from outrages of every
kind, and able to present white gloves to
the Judges at almost all the Quarter
Sessions of the Courts, there is no excuse
for the exceptional legislation by which
Ireland is oppressed under the Crimes
or Coercion Acts. In a single year there
have been more gross crimes, and crimes
of every degree committed in London
alone, than in ten years in all Ireland.

MR. DALTON MCCARTHY, M. P.

In his twelfth of July speech at Stay-
ner, Mr. D'Alton McCarthy said:

"Now if there is a man here who sup-
ported me at my last election who says I
voted wrongly; if there be a man in this
constituency who says I voted wrong,
then I never was a fitting representative
for such an elector."

Mr. McCarthy must know in his heart
that every Catholic who voted for him
made an egregious mistake in fancying
that he is capable of giving an intelligent
or generous vote on any question even
remotely connected with Ireland or the
Catholic Church. On every occasion
when a motion was made in the House
of Commons in favor of Home Rule or
in sympathy with Gladstone or Parnell's
efforts, D'Alton McCarthy's vote and
eloquence was on the side of oppression
and bigotry. His speech on the Jesuits'
Estate Act was in perfect keeping with
all his previous bigoted record. He says
now at Stayner that Mr. Mercer went
down on his knees to the Pope of Rome
to ask the gracious permission of His
Holiness to sell the property belonging
to the crown and held by the crown for
educational purposes of the people
of Lower Canada. Is Mr. McCarthy
capable of telling the truth when he
speaks of the Pope or the Catholic
Church? There are two errors in the
above statement. Mr. Mercer did not
go down on his knees; he merely asked
the Pope's consent to and ratification of
a bargain that would transfer Church
property to the crown and government
of Quebec. The second mistake is the
statement that the Jesuits' estates be-
longed to the crown already. If so,
why could not the Imperial Govern-
ment hand over those estates to Gen-
eral Amherst, who wanted them,
or to any other subject willing to pur-
chase them? The fact is, as explained
by Hon. John Thompson, the Imperial

Government could not give a proper
title deed to any intending purchaser.
The Government would have committed
a grave offence against the laws of
nations had it taken possession of those
estates or of any other corporate or pri-
vate property. It was, therefore, in the
right of the Church, or the Head of the
Church, to consent to the disposal of its
own property. "It was held," says Mr.
McCarthy "by the Government for edu-
cational purposes of the people of
Quebec." And to what other purposes
is it now applied? The Pope said: All
the money (\$400,000) obtained for the
land should be kept in Lower Canada,
and for the purposes of education. Mr.
McCarthy maintains that such has not
been done, because \$100,000 were given
to the departed Jesuits, \$10,000 to this
Bishop and \$10,000 to that Bishop.
Is this honest on the part of an honora-
ble man, or of any man holding the
position of Mr. D'Alton McCarthy?
And all this money given away out of a
fund in which, he says, the Protestant
minority are interested, for educational
purposes. In the first place, the Jesu-
its have not departed. They are still in
Lower Canada, engaged in the work of
education and in none other. As no
Jesuit can put one dollar of that money
to his own private use, it must be all
spent for educational purposes, ex-
actly as originally intended. The
\$100,000 given to each Bishop is handed
over on condition that he have a college
requiring such amount and that every
cent of the \$100,000 be applied to and
spent for educational purposes. If the
Protestant minority are interested, their
interests have been well provided for,
since they get \$800,000; so that Mr.
McCarthy's whole plea, being founded
on misrepresentation, if not absolute
lying, is unworthy of a man holding the
position he does and enjoying the repu-
tation he has earned of an able jurist
and a finished orator. As no eloquence
or reputation for oratory can live on lies
we are convinced the speech of Mr.
D'Alton McCarthy, delivered at Stayner
on the 12th July, to be the beginning of
a downward career and of a declining
reputation, either as a jurist or a states-
man.

GLADSTONE ON REPEAL OF
THE UNION.

Mr. Gladstone has written an able
historical document on the cursed union
that robbed Ireland of her Parliament,
her glory and her life. Mr. Balfour and
other calous persecutors of Irish tenants
have been maintaining that British rule
in Ireland rested upon a moral basis,
and that, having been accepted by the
Irish people, they have nothing to do
but submit to their sad fate. Mr. Glad-
stone denies absolutely that Ireland ever
consented to British rule; that the union
of England and Ireland was brought
about by fraud, perjury, corruption,
cruelty, torture and terrorism. He
enlightens Englishmen on the violent
and unscrupulous means employed to
force upon Ireland a union that Lord
Byron describes as the "union of the
shark with its prey." The article has
appeared in the Nineteenth Century,
and is entitled "Plain Speaking on the
Irish Union." Mr. Gladstone says that
when the whole truth is told, and when
the eyes of his countrymen are opened
to all the horrors of infamous means re-
sorted to for the purpose of robbing
Ireland of its autonomy, that British rule
of fair play will insist upon it that Eng-
land's policy be reversed and that Ire-
land be once more restored to the free-
dom and luxury of managing her own
internal affairs. His views and argu-
ments are all based upon admissions of
the principal agents employed by Great
Britain in forcing the union upon the
Irish. Lord Cornwallis, Lord Lieutenant
of Ireland, is quoted; also Sir Ralph
Abercromby, Commander-in-chief of
the British forces in Ireland
during the rebellion of '98, who said
that: "Cossacks or Calkmucks were not
in his belief capable of perpetrat-
ing the cruelties and atrocities which
the Irish had to suffer at the hands of the
armed yeomen and the hired assassins
from Germany that were let loose upon
the unresisting men and women after
the rebellion was crushed and peace had
been proclaimed." Sir John More, who
died afterwards in the Peninsular War,
Colonel Napier and several other Eng-
lishmen, whose testimony cannot be
gainsaid, are cited in testimony of the
grave charges of injustice and wrong and
unheard-of cruelties which Mr. Glad-
stone piles up against the British Govern-
ment of that woful time and period.
Balfour had said that Mr. Gladstone
relied upon bad history for his arraign-
ment of Pitt and Castlereagh's atrocious
laws and persecutions of the Irish; but
now the Grand Old Man has turned the
tables on his unscrupulous adversary,
and shows clearly, as the sun at noon,
that all the "bad history" is on the side
of Ireland's past and present oppressors.

Mr. Gladstone, quoting from the Par-
liamentary Commission, says: "When Mr. W.
O'Brien was asked by Sir Richard
Webster: 'The only objection you had to
rebellion, was it not that you were not
strong enough to resist England?' 'Cer-

tainly,' said O'Brien, 'that is the only
reason why we did not rebel.' 'If you
had the power then you would go into
open rebellion.' 'Undoubtedly,' an-
swered Mr. O'Brien, adding that he was
in advance of most Irishmen. "Doubt-
less they are in advance," continues Mr.
Gladstone, "as regards such near con-
templation of the horrors of civil war."
But I should like to have asked Mr.
O'Brien whether the Irish nations regard
the Act of Union as possessed of the
same moral authority as they would
ascribe to the laws against theft and
murder, or, indeed, as possessed of any
authority at all. There may, indeed, be
immorality in this calculated resistance
even to immoral laws, but such resist-
ance is not in itself immoral."

Dividing the capital charge against
the union policy into two grand heads
of Fraud and Violence, each of them is
sufficient to invalidate the moral author-
ity of the Act. Mr. Gladstone gives
abundant proofs that both fraud and
violence were employed in forcing the
Act of Union, and that, therefore, out-
side of the bayonets which support it,
the Act of Irish Union is not worth
the parchment upon which it is written,
because, as he lays down: "Instruments
obtained by fraud are voidable at law." Then
a contrast is drawn between the
maddening, ferocious and prolonged oppres-
sion of the Irish, with the merciful,
patient and honorable demeanor of the
latter. For instance, General Gordon
says of the rebellion in '98: "Amid all
their atrocities the chastity of the fair
sex was respected by the rebels. I have
not been able to ascertain one instance
to the contrary in the County of Wexford,
though many beautiful young women
were absolutely in their power." Not
so with the king's forces, who were sup-
posed to be under discipline: "For many
of the female relatives, taken promiscu-
ously with the men, suffered in regard of
their chastity and also with regard to
health, by their brutally constrained ac-
quaintance with the soldiery."

"On the 7th of June, after the massacre
at Scullabogue, Father Roche, so active
in arms," says Mr. Gladstone, "issued a
Proclamation, containing the following
passages:

"In the moment of triumph, my coun-
trymen, let not your victories be tar-
nished with any wanton act of cruelty.
To promote a union of brother-
hood and affection among our country-
men of all religious persuasions has been
the principal object. We have sworn in
our most solemn manner; we have as-
sociated for this noble purpose, and no
power on earth shall shake our resolu-
tion."

And General Harvey, then Com-
mander-in-Chief (of the Irish), on the
6th of June, issued general orders, which
contained these words:

"Any goods that shall have been plun-
dered from any house, if not brought
into headquarters, or returned immedi-
ately to the houses of owners thereof, all
persons so plundering as aforesaid shall,
on being convicted thereof, suffer death.
It is also resolved that any person or
persons who shall take upon them to
kill or murder any person or persons,
burn any house, or commit any plunder
without special written orders from the
Commander-in-Chief shall suffer death."

And this, be it borne in mind, while
plunder, incendiarism, rape, torture,
and murder were carried on wholesale
in the name of law and order before the
Rebellion, during it, and (as Lord Corn-
wallis has borne witness) after it.
How Irish life was valued wholesale
we may judge from the following narra-
tive: On May 28th two thousand men
collected in arms made a proposal to
surrender them, and to go home, which
was wisely accepted. But one of them
said he would only give his gun empty
and he discharged it with the muzzle
upwards. Hereupon the (British) soldier
and a troop of formidable cavalry slew two
hundred men, and many more would have
perished had not the General recalled
his forces. So in early copy of (I think)
the Times dated in September, 1798,
which I have seen, an officer reports to
his superior—without shame and appar-
ently with every conscience of con-
science—that he set a body of men who
had taken arms on the loading of Gen-
eral Humbert and slaughtered about
seventy of them, though they made no
attempt at resistance! It would be idle
to relate the very large numbers of those
slain in action.

Every effort was indeed made to pre-
vent the rebels from observing the laws
of war, as when they sent a flag of truce
it was fired upon. After relating how
one Furlong was shot in the execution of
such a mission Gordon adds a note:

To shoot all persons carrying flags of
truce from the rebels appears to have
been a maxim with His Majesty's forces.
It is not the vast destruction of rebel
life which constitutes the gravamen of
the case, but the reckless and lawless
spirit in which the proceedings as a rule
were carried on. Gordon gives one or
two instances. A Protestant clergyman
saw in Newtownbarry on the 25th of
May a number of women and children
on their knees. They were praying for
leave to extricate some of their effects
from their burning cabins. Not only was
this refused but the clergyman, who
three days after distinguished himself on
the Royal side at Enn