

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond

street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Ireland."

REV. WILLIAM F. LANNERY.

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

Messrs. DONAT CROWE, LUKE KING and

JOHN NICHOLSON are authorized to receive

subscriptions and transact all other busi-

ness for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agent for Alexandria, Glennevis and

Leaside.—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Rates of advertising—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 Catho-

lic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

All correspondence on business should be

addressed to the Proprietor.

Arrears 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.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Oct. 27th, 1888.

PROSPECTS OF ROMANISM.

Dr. Dorchester, who in his history lately published accused Catholics of the desire to destroy the religious liberty of Protestants in the United States, and quoted Archbishop Ryan as expressly declaring that this would be the certain result, if Catholics ever should become strong enough, has been further enlightening the public on the "Prospects of Romanism." Being called to task for misquoting Archbishop Ryan, he was honorable enough to acknowledge that he had fallen into an error from carelessly copying a number of respectable periodicals which had furnished him with the quotation, and accordingly he apologized to the Archbishop. His letter of apology we need not reproduce, as it appeared lately in the columns of the CATHOLIC RECORD. At all events this whole occurrence is not calculated to inspire very great confidence in the blunderer as one specially competent to deal with Catholic matters, as he never would have made such a blunder, if he had been moderately acquainted with his subject.

The Doctor's new subject is treated as an answer to a question in the magazine of Rev. Joseph Cook of Boston, "Our Day", and is stated to be one of several "Questions to Specialists." The question which our "Specialist" Dr. Dorchester undertakes to answer is: "What are the prospects of Roman Catholicism in the United States?" A specialist on this subject ought to be a careful statistician, weighing his data so as to eliminate errors from the figures which he has before him, when such exist. He ought to be able to detect oversights, and even to evolve truth out of a mixed mass of truth and falsehood. Now in his treatment of the subject named at the head of this article, the Doctor has proved himself utterly incapable of fulfilling these duties of a statistician, and even if he be perfectly honest in the views which he upholds, we maintain that his failure in this respect is sufficient to make his conclusions on the "Prospects of Romanism" utterly unreliable.

As yet we have only seen that portion of Dr. Dorchester's essay which was published in the Globe of the 6th inst. From this we begin by taking the following extract. The year 1886 in the first occurrence of the date, we change to 1888, as the whole context shows that the year 1887 is compared with 1888, and not 1886. This error is, of course, typographical:

"Taking the Catholic Year Book for 1887, and comparing it with the Year Book for 1888, I find there has been an actual diminution, so far as their figures go, in churches, in chapels and stations, in priests, in parochial schools, and in charitable institutions. For instance, 81 less churches are reported in the Year Book for 1888 than in the Year Book for 1887, 224 less chapels and stations, 62 less priests, 91 less parochial schools, 26 662 less pupils in parochial schools, and 13 less charitable institutions. I mention this peculiar change as a query. I wish somebody would explain it. It is possible that there are less complete returns made now than before, but it is a little singular that in these six leading items there should be this falling off."

"A little singular!" This is indeed putting the matter mildly. Not a week passes in which we do not read of the opening or the laying of the corner-stones of new churches and parochial schools throughout the United States, from Cape Flattery to Key West, and seldom do we hear that the buildings thus erected are either closed to their purpose or that they have taken flight to the moon. It is, therefore, a little, or perhaps not a little singular that the number of them should have decreased, and they have not: "Eighty-one less churches, 224 less chapels and stations, 91 less parochial schools, and 13 less charitable institutions." altogether a decrease of 409! This is simply preposterous.

Yet it is a fact which we must concede that Dr. Dorchester has found figures in Sadlier's Catholic Directory, or Year Book, which might seem to a cursory reader to bear him out in his statement. But the Doctor is presented to us, not as a merely cursory reader, but as a specialist, that is, one who has mastered his subject. Now did he not notice that the "Year Book" does not profess to give for either year a full report of the number of parochial schools, or of chapels and stations? And the same is true of the

number of pupils in the parochial schools, and of charitable institutions, though in the last case the report is more complete than in the others. The dioceses which have given returns under each of these heads are different in the two years named, so that the Doctor by his method of comparison deduces the increase or decrease in each case by comparing two territories which are quite different from each other in the two years named. If he had compared the same territory for both years, the result would have been quite different, and this is what a specialist would have done, if he were honest. We shall endeavor to show the result of this method of procedure.

Dr. Dorchester's figures are taken from Sadlier's Directory, by a superficial glance at totals, without reference to the territory they regard, and if this were a correct method of computing statistics, his conclusions would be correct. We are sorry to say that beside the fact that these totals cover a different territory, there are also some inaccuracies in the totals, arising from typographical errors, and from transferring to the summary figures which differ from those which are given in the diocesan reports. These errors must be attributed to the compilers of the Directory, but to get at the truth they must be eliminated. We hope that in future more care will be devoted to the compilation of the Directory. This work is a grand contribution to the history of the Catholic Church on this continent, but carelessness in its compilation mars its value very much. It contains a vast amount of facts relative to the Church's history, and much credit is due to the enterprising firm of the Messrs. Sadlier who issue it regularly every year, but in collating these facts into tables, unless care be given to the work, much of the confidence which has hitherto been given to it will necessarily be withdrawn.

Dr. Dorchester may find in what we have said here the explanation of the apparent anomaly of the decrease in leading items, which so much surprises him. We do not pretend that our corrections of Messrs. Sadlier's tables are a complete or exact statement of the case. In the hurried manner in which we have been obliged to make our observations, some errors may have escaped our notice, but we are certainly very near the exact figures which a more leisurely examination would give.

Let us first take the figures regarding parochial schools. There are in the United States 79 dioceses. Of these many do not state in their reports the number of parochial schools comprised within their boundaries; and even when a number is given in the tabular summary of the directory, it is sometimes found to be a mere estimate of the compiler on insufficient data. We find 56 dioceses which give these reports, both in 1887 and 1888, and in certain of these cases the figures given in the tabular statement are not those given in the diocesan reports. For these reasons we omit taking into account the dioceses of Little Rock, New Orleans, Milwaukee, Oregon, Leavenworth, Concordia, Kansas, Santa Fe and Indian Territory. It is not to better our case that we omit these, as will be evident when we compare the figures. Thus, in the diocese of Little Rock, the tabular number of schools is 11 for 1888, whereas the diocesan report merely states that there were "20 schools in 1887." In New Orleans the tabular summary gives 53 and 40 for the number of schools in the successive years, whereas the diocesan reports state the matter thus: for 1887 the number of academies and free schools under supervision of the priests is said to be 40, and for 1888 it is merely said there are "parochial schools in every parish." Evidently we must reject the figures 53 and 40 as guesses of the compiler. Similar reasons hold for the other dioceses we have named. Dakota we include in our estimate, because though it is accidentally omitted in the summary, it gives accurate returns for both years, viz.: 21, 24, respectively. Monterey, which is placed in the tables as having 4 and 15 schools in the successive years, reports itself as having 15 in each year. If we wished to cook the figures, we would, of course, let Monterey stand as in the table. We would do the same with Milwaukee, as the figures are given for this diocese at 75, 118, respectively. We have on making these corrections, as we have stated above, 56 dioceses with the schools for each year as in the following table. We give results by Ecclesiastical Provinces for greater compactness:

Ecc. Pro.	Dioceses fully reported	Schools in 1887	Schools in 1888
Baltimore.....	5	142	145
Boston.....	7	189	205
Chicago.....	3	244	253
Cincinnati.....	8	474	494
Cincinnati.....	3	112	121
Milwaukee.....	3	70	77
New Orleans....	5	395	400
New York.....	2	8	10
Oregon.....	5	239	244
Philadelphia....	5	42	42
San Francisco..	4	27	27
Santa Fe.....	3	243	252
St. Louis.....	8		
	56	2,185	2,270

It is thus seen that parochial schools have increased by 85 in the 56 dioceses which have reported for both years. There can be very little doubt that the remaining 23 dioceses have had a similar increase, which is a very different showing

from that which a superficial glance at the bottom of one page of the Directory would lead one to suppose.

Treating the details of the number of pupils attending the schools in the same way, the result will be similar, except that the increase of the number of pupils attending each school would be found larger in proportion, and so with each of the other heads under which Dr. Dorchester has found a decrease.

In the case of the number of priests and of churches, there should be much greater accuracy in the Directory summary. We notice the following errors under these heads: Chicago is stated to have 206 priests. The diocesan report gives 286. Dakota is omitted in 1888 with 90 priests. Concordia is stated in the table to have 22 priests. The diocesan report gives the names of 23. Thus the table is to be corrected by adding 171 to the number of priests for 1888. The increase for the year is therefore 109 priests, instead of a decrease of 62.

As to the number of churches we notice these errors: In 1888 Dakota is omitted with 130 churches. Detroit is reported with 144 in 1887 and 84 in 1888. Only the Churches with resident pastors are numbered, and these are given in the diocesan report as 84 in each year. Probably if the churches without resident pastors were given there would be an increase. The tables give a decrease of 9 in Boston, whereas the diocesan reports state that the number was the same in each year, 157. In Fort Wayne a similar decrease of 2 is an error. The reports give 122 in each year. The tables give Little Rock 87 churches in 1888, an increase of 52. This should be 37, an increase of 2. In Mobile the diocesan report for 1887 states that there were 36 churches, not 40, as counted in the table. Thus to obtain the truth we must deduct 4 from the tabular number of churches given for 1887, and we must add 91 to the number for 1888. When these corrections are made we shall have the increase for the year 74, instead of a falling off of 81.

The lists of priests and churches are the only two of all the heads which profess to be complete in the Directory for all the dioceses, and which cover the same territory. Under the heads chapels and stations, and charitable institutions, the same process of correction which we have followed will give a similar result, a satisfactory increase in every case.

It was our intention when beginning this article to have reviewed others of Dr. Dorchester's statements, but as we have already carried this article to considerable length, we shall content ourselves with a few general remarks upon some of the salient points treated by him.

He says "Romanism has made five great efforts to capture this country of ours." One of these efforts consisted in an attempt at the "separation, dismemberment and destruction of the early Protestant colonies." The fact is that the only efforts made in the Territory which now forms the United States, to establish religious persecution, were made by Protestants. While the pious pilgrims of New England and their descendants were persecuting as heretics, with pillory and fire, those who differed from them, the Catholics of Maryland were proclaiming universal toleration and religious equality to all Christians.

He also endeavors to show that at least at the present time the progress of Protestantism is greater than that of Catholicism, or "Romanism," as he terms it, after the fashion of intolerant polemicists. We shall at a future time enter more specifically into this question. For the present we shall only remark that he has a convenient way of representing the number of Protestants by multiplying by 3½ the figures of the Evangelical Church books representing membership, so as to arrive at the number of adherents. This method of making reliable statistics is quite on a par with his specialist tactics by which he shows the decrease of the Catholic Church in 1887-1888.

Regarding the real prospects of the Catholic Church he says absolutely nothing: unless it be to his purpose to say: "A common sentiment seems to be developing among leading Roman Catholic laymen that the Pope, so far as political matters are concerned, must keep his hands off from the United States." In what way the Pope has endeavored to interfere in the political matters of the United States the Doctor does not condescend to enlighten us, for the good reason that there has been no such interference in the past, nor will there be in the future, except in so far as to point out that it is the duty of politicians, as of all men, and the duty of states also, to govern their actions in accordance with the laws of God. This the Pope does teach, but he does so in conformity with the mandate on which his authority rests: "Teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you."

THE Prince Edward Island newspapers chronicle the late clerical changes in the diocese of Charlottetown: The Rev. A. E. Bourke, formerly secretary of the diocese and lately in charge of Vernon River and Rustico, has been named pastor of the Sacred Heart mission, Alberton; the Rev. Stephen Phelan assumes the pastoral charge of Georgetown. The Rev. Francis Gallant, curate of the Cathedral, is promoted to the pastorate of St. Ann's, Hope River, and the Rev. G. De Finance takes Father McPhee's place at Rustico, that gentleman being absent in Colorado for the winter for the benefit of his health. Father McElmeel, recently ordained, has been stationed at the cathedral.

RELIGION AND COUNTRY.

One fact in the relations of Irishmen to each other, and to the people of England and Scotland, which in the past has undoubtedly been a great obstacle to the obtaining of Home Rule, or indeed justice to Ireland, in any form, is the difference of religious belief. If it had not been for the existence of such difference, the question of Home Rule would indeed never have arisen to its present magnitude, for the oppression of which Ireland has had to complain would never have existed to the extent to which it has been carried, for it is well known that religious hate was a great factor in bringing about the state of affairs now existing in the country. The fanatical spirit prevailed especially in the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and William III., and under the benign protectorate of Cromwell, was established an alien absentee landlordism, a system which was rendered still more odious and noxious by the removal of the seat of Government, such as it was, from Ireland, at the beginning of this century, and it was by fostering religious dissension in the country that England was able ever since to preserve the system by which the tenantry have been reduced to a condition far more galling than that under which the black slaves of the South suffered at any time.

The land question of Ireland is not, however, by any means a religious question, nor is its oppressiveness confined by any means to Catholics, or to the Catholic provinces, and there is no reason whatever why the Nationalist agitation should be confined to Catholics, or why it should be looked upon as a movement of Catholics. It is a movement of the people of Ireland for the amelioration of their condition, and it is a movement of Catholics only in this sense that as Catholics constitute the great majority of the people, the majority of those who will be benefited by obtaining redress will be Catholics, just as the majority of those who suffer under the present bad laws are Catholics. But the Ulster Protestants are not exempt from their oppressiveness, nor are the Protestants of the other Provinces treated any more mercifully than their Catholic neighbors, except as far as they are themselves landlords, or are placed in lucrative positions because of their want of sympathy with the general population. From these facts it may well be matter for surprise that the parties in Ireland should be so nearly divided by religious lines, that the Catholics should be for the most part Nationalists, and the Protestants Unionists. Yet this is far from being universally the case. Among the supporters of landlord tyranny there are Catholics, some being themselves rack-renting landlords, others being bound to the landlord party by ties of interest or Government employment, while many Protestants are among the most earnest workers in the Nationalist cause, among whom Mr. Parnell himself stands pre-eminent. And this has ever been the case in the Nationalist movements of the past, which have always witnessed many noble Protestants working faithfully side by side with their Catholic compatriots.

It is encouraging to find that in the present Nationalist movement many Protestants of all denominations are laboring in the same cause with the Catholic majority, and exhibit their sympathy for the tenants who have been evicted. Archbishop Plunkett's patriotic words to the conference of his clergy will not soon be forgotten by the Irish people, wherein he declared that like thousands of Episcopalians and other Protestants, he repudiated the Government of Ireland by means of an English garrison; and that many others of the Anglican clergy entertain similar sentiments. It is manifest by a late letter from the Rev. Alfred Burton, Rector of Stethworth, England, to the editor of United Ireland, enclosing £23 7s 10d, for the Evicted Tenants' fund, which amount was subscribed by English Church clergymen as "a mark of deep and heartfelt sympathy with the poor tenants in the gross cruelty and shameful injustice meted out to them under cover of British law, and further, as a mark of our admiration of the manful and resolute patience they have displayed in their many and great sufferings."

The Rev. Mr. Burton quotes from several of the letters he received with the subscriptions, one of which, that of the Dean of Winchester, expresses regret that he can only send £1; but he adds: "I do so with all my heart." The Rev. C. D. Cleaver writes: "Being an Irishman myself, and having tenants in Ireland, my purse is being continually emptied for Irish purposes. I have seen more than enough of the oppression and robbery of the poor tenants. In my young days I simply hated the English. But I am thankful to have learned how wide and general is the sympathy felt by the English people, now that they know a little of the facts, for those who have been so long oppressed and trodden in the dust in my poor country." The Rev. G. W. Rolfe, Rector of Swanton Novers, writes: "There is one eviction I should like to see—that of Balfour, the Blunderer."

On the other hand, we find among the Nationalist members of Parliament many

Protestants who do not yield in patriotism to their Catholic colleagues. Among these are the following: Dublin city is represented by Thomas A. Dickson, the City of Cork by Chas. S. Parnell, the City of Limerick by Wm. Abraham, the City of Waterford by Douglas Pym, North East Cork by Chas. K. Tanner, the City of Galway by Wm. Pinkerton, Clare by Jeremiah Jordan, Donegal by Swift McNeill, and Queen's Co. by the blind member, W. A. McDonald.

When it is considered that every one of these constituencies, sending Protestant members to represent them in Parliament, is Catholic to an overwhelming extent, it will be seen that the Nationalists are thoroughly united and in earnest in the cause of their country, and that they do not intend to let religious differences keep them asunder. In many cases, indeed, they have elected Protestants in preference to Catholics, whom they could have got to represent their views equally well. This brotherly feeling exhibited by Catholic voters toward their Protestant fellow-Nationalists gives promise of early success to the common cause, because it is an unanswerable refutation of the oft-repeated allegation that the liberties of Protestants would not be safe in an Irish National Parliament.

DISSOLUTION OF THE MORMON CHURCH.

The Supreme Court of Utah has entered a final judgment escheating to the Government the property of the Mormon Church. The suit was brought under an Act of Congress of 10th February, 1887, and a receiver was appointed who succeeded in collecting \$1,000,000 worth of real and personal property. The decree declares the Church corporation dissolved, and that all the property of the late corporation reverts to the Government. The decree further states that the present church maintains polygamy, and that the possession of any property would be for the upholding of that unlawful practice. The case has been taken by the Mormons to the Supreme Court of the United States, before which it will be hotly contested, but there seems to be little doubt that the decree will be upheld, and the total dissolution of the Mormon Church is inevitable.

The Mormons seem themselves to be convinced that their days are numbered in Utah, and they are looking for other fields in which to establish themselves. It is stated that they have bought land in Mexico, and that they will establish a colony there. They are already moving in that direction, but polygamy will no more be tolerated among the Mexicans than it has been in the United States.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN ON COERCION.

Mr. Chamberlain, in a recent speech, makes the following charge against the Nationalists who have been the victims of Balfour's Coercion Courts. He says:

"What do you mean by Coercion? I will tell you what I mean, and I denounce coercion as strongly as any person. I mean the coercion of the weak and oppressed, the shooting of old men, the mutilation and outrage and violence of all kinds established by the decrees of a secret tribunal, and inflicted upon persons who cannot defend themselves, the coercion which denied the rites of burial to the dead and the rites of religion to the living. But this is not the Coercion which the Gladstonians denounce. The Gladstonians denounce the Coercion of the law. In Ireland Coercion means only what it means in England and Scotland, that men must obey the law. The second clause of the Crimes Act provides that certain offences, every one of which is punishable at the present time by imprisonment in England, should be tried before two magistrates instead of a jury."

It would be hard to compress more falsehoods within so narrow a compass as Mr. Chamberlain has succeeded in doing. Over and over again it has been demonstrated that there are fewer crimes, of the character described by Mr. Chamberlain, committed in Ireland, than in England, such as the shooting of innocent old men and the mutilation of cattle. It is not for the punishment of these crimes at all that the Coercion Act was passed. Chief Baron Palles and Baron Dowse have decided many times that the Coercion Act creates crimes, which are not crimes in England and Scotland, and Mr. Chamberlain must have known that this is the case. It is evident therefore that he wilfully violates the truth in the above statement. The crimes for which Messrs. O'Brien, Dillon, Blunt, T. D. Sullivan, and the three thousand other victims of Coercion were convicted bear no resemblance to the cowardly and atrocious acts described by Mr. Chamberlain. They are guilty only of maintaining the cause of the oppressed and vindicating their right to free speech. The Coercion Act has nothing to do with the repression of real crime in Ireland.

A fair specimen of the kind of crimes which are punished under Coercion Law is to be found in sentences passed upon Fathers Farrelly and Clarke, who were convicted of boycotting John O'Connor of Kevin st., Dublin. Mr. O'Connor was guilty of evicting Mr. Waldron under circumstances of special cruelty. Mr. Waldron was tenant for thirty years, during which time he paid £2, 10s an acre and all taxes, without receiving any reduction.

His people were tenants on the same property for eighty years previously, and the house from which he was evicted was his own property. The two priests commented very severely on the unjust conduct of the landlord, which was acknowledged even by the Crown to be unreasonable, harsh and unjust. The priests did no more than recommend the people to make use of their legal right not to deal with Mr. O'Connor when buying butter, that so they might obtain justice for the harshly-treated tenant. For this they have been convicted and sentenced to six weeks' imprisonment each.

MR. DILLON'S SENTIMENTS.

Mr. John Dillon, M. P., made his first public pronouncement since his release from prison, at the meeting of the Central branch of the National League, in Dublin, on the 25th ult., at which meeting he presided. He informed the members present that he appeared before them as a "hardened sinner," after having had the advantage of three months of quietude for reflection. In the views of the present Government and of Mr. Chamberlain, it is, no doubt, a crime, a sin of the blackest dye to desire for Ireland prosperity and happiness—it is a most heinous crime to wish the people to defend themselves resolutely and effectually against the rack-renters who are sucking the very life's blood from the country, and in this sense, Mr. Dillon is undoubtedly a sinner. Time for meditation has hardened him in his sin, and he is the same uncompromising foe to tyranny that he was when first immured in the cells. But only his enemies, the enemies of liberty, the advocates and upholders of tyranny in its worst form will call this a sin. All others will honor Mr. Dillon as a patriot, and the more staunchly he adheres to his former course of loving his country and battling with its oppressors, the more ardent will be the affection with which his compatriots will regard him.

He has declared that imprisonment has not changed him. Every one expected that on his release he would be ready to battle for his country's rights as before, and to march in the front rank. No one, therefore, will be disappointed in his declarations that he will continue to labor in his country's cause and to do battle as before for Ireland's right as a nation.

Concerning the manner in which he was treated in prison, Mr. Dillon gave Mr. Balfour all the credit he was entitled to for having carried out his pronounced determination to treat Irish political prisoners as culprits of the worst class. He had been scandalously found guilty on evidence which no crown prosecutor would dare to place before even a packed jury, and then he was treated as a common pickpocket. If he was still alive, he had to thank, not the system under which he was imprisoned, but the prison officials, who had shown humanity towards him which the men who had sent him to prison did not manifest.

A remarkable feature in Mr. Dillon's address is the testimony he gave to the great change which has taken place in the feelings of Englishmen and Scotchmen towards Ireland within the last few years. There was a time when he hated the name and power of England, but he had experienced from Englishmen many acts of kindness, and much sympathy, and now he would receive in English and Scotch towns a reception very similar to that which Cork or Dublin would accord to him.

This undoubtedly makes it manifest that the rights of Ireland are being recognized in England and Scotland in a way in which they have never been before. The English and Scotch people as a rule appreciate that the people of Ireland are not any longer strangers, but brethren who are to be treated as freemen and fellow-citizens. This is all that Ireland asks, and if this were once granted we would hear no more of Irish grievances, and of the dissatisfaction which now exists against alien rule. Irishmen require to exercise much patience before they will gain the justice they demand, but they are greatly encouraged by the generosity which the people of Great Britain now extend towards them, and like Mr. Dillon himself, the changed attitude of the people of the sister countries is rapidly convincing them that their just rights will not be delayed much longer, and that the Empire will become really strong in the councils of the world, when a union of hearts will be firmly established between the people of the three kingdoms. In the meantime Ireland must not abate one iota of her demands, for she can never occupy the position of a constituent and contented party to the Union, until her people be recognized as having liberties equally sacred with those of Englishmen and Scotchmen. Were the latter suffering under the same iron rule as Irishmen, their grievances would have been redressed long ago. It is not wonderful at all, therefore, that some are discouraged at the present prospect, and incline to adopt methods for attaining redress which only utter despair would dictate. The majority of Irishmen, however, are more than ever convinced that by constitutional measures that redress is within their reach, and will soon be gained.