

The Catholic Register.

"Truth is Catholic; proclaim it ever, and God will efface the rest."—BALMEZ.

VOL. IV.—NO. 5

TORONTO, THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 1896.

PRICE FIVE CENTS.

NATIONAL CONVENTION

Speech by Mr. John Dillon, M.P., at Clondalkin.

The suggestion of the Archbishop of Toronto—Irishmen from abroad who attend a convention will have nothing to do with Personal Quarrels—The securing of unity the only consideration.

In a magnificent speech delivered at Clondalkin, on January 11, Mr. John Dillon, M.P., made the following reference to the coming convention of the Irish race:

You will remember that a short time ago a resolution was passed at a large meeting of the Irish Party, at which 67 out of a total of 70 members were present. That resolution I shall now read, as I think it well that the country should again be reminded of its terms. The resolution was as follows: "That this Party approves of the suggestion made by the Archbishop of Toronto in favor of a National Convention representative of the Irish race throughout the world, and that with the view of carrying this decision into effect the Chairman and Committee of the Irish Party are hereby authorized to communicate with the Executive of the National Federation, and jointly with them to make arrangements for the holding of such a convention." The first thing I have to say with reference to that resolution is, that it was passed unanimously, and therefore it stands as the unanimous decision of the National Party (hear, hear). It was a resolution framed, as you will see, for the purpose of leaving questions of detail as to the time and the method of summoning that Convention to whatever committee would be charged with the duty of summoning it. Nothing was affirmed but that the Convention should be called, and that at that Convention there should be a representation of our exiled brethren in Great Britain, America, Canada and Australia. When we remember the circumstances which led up to the passing of that resolution I cannot for the life of me see how any man could have ventured to propose that our exiled brethren, our faithful allies in the United States, Canada and Australia should have a voice in this great Convention (cheers). That resolution arose out of a letter addressed to the Hon. Edward Clarke, who is undoubtedly one of the ablest representatives of our race, to the Most Rev. Dr. John Walsh.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF TORONTO.

A prelate of great eminence and distinction in the Catholic Church—a man who through many years, has proved himself to be one of the most sterling Nationalists in the world (cheers). He made the suggestion that the Convention should be summoned on those lines; therefore I cannot understand how there could be from any quarter any objection to that principle (hear, hear). But the Irish Party never attempted to lay down any detailed regulations as to what the delegates from abroad should have a vote or should not have a vote, or should be admitted to have a consultative voice at the Convention. Nor did the Irish Party say what number of delegates from abroad should be summoned. All these matters are left to the discretion of the committee, and do not in the least affect the principle to which I have referred (hear, hear). For my own part I desire to say, as the mover of the resolution, as it has been made the subject of considerable discussion during the last few days, that it never occurred to me that you should summon men from across the Atlantic, still less from the other side of the world, any very large number of Irishmen, but it did occur to me that many influential Irishmen desire to say their views before that Convention; that it was desirable that we should not shut the doors against those Irishmen from abroad, but that

WE SHOULD WELCOME THEM

and hear their views (loud cheers). But the idea of saying that we invited Irishmen from America and Australia to attend this Convention for the purpose of settling down the others is absurd (hear, hear). But whether Irishmen from America or Australia will have votes or not their numbers will be extremely small as compared with the number of other Irishmen who will be present, and I think you will all remember that there is to-day any one Nationalist who would grudge them a voice in that Convention if they choose to come across the Atlantic (loud cheers). Now, so much for the question of delegates. I would like to say a word in reference to some carrying criticism which has been directed towards this proposal of a National Convention. There are some men in the world whom it is impossible to satisfy (hear, hear). You may make any proposal you like and they will still fault with it. I remember for the last year or year and a half the demands that were made by certain individuals for a National Convention. A National Convention has been ordered by the National Party and all they are to do is to object. There is no one particular form of criticism to which I shall direct your attention here to-night, because it appears to me to be utterly absurd and childish. There are in Ireland a certain number of individuals who seem to be in the habit of expressing their disapproval of the proposal of a National Convention would be to consider and arrive at a conclusion upon what they are pleased to describe as the controversy between Mr. Healy and Mr. Dil-

lon. I say such men are unfit for public life. The idea of summing up two hundred, or it may be two thousand, delegates from all parts of Ireland, not to speak of those who may come from abroad or from England, for the specific purpose of investigating an alleged quarrel between Mr. Healy and Mr. Dillon is a most idiotic idea.

THE BILLEN OF THE NATIONAL CONVENTION will be, in my opinion, not to investigate personal quarrels, or to go into personal matters, but to consider on what lines for the future the National Party can be kept together, to lay down principles by the observation of which unity may be preserved in the National ranks, and to consider great broad issues of policy. I say, in my judgment, that the first man who stands up when that Convention assembles, as probably it will before very long—though I am in no violent hurry so long as there is in the air of a strong union amongst Irish Nationalists—if the National Convention resulted in such a union, then I say it would be marked in the history of this country as the most glorious Convention that ever was held. The National Convention assembles the first man who begins to talk of the disputes between Mr. Dillon and Mr. Healy, or Mr. A. or Mr. B., will be, in my judgment, caught down or run out of the room. The question will be the consideration of rules, regulations and principles which will be considered necessary by the Convention for the maintenance of union and the securing of unity of action amongst Nationalists. And then the question will be the consideration of the broad lines of a policy of public policy on which the future conduct of the National movement is to be carried on (applause). Having laid down these principles, I hold that the business of the National Convention will then be to take measures to provide the necessary means to carry on the National movement, and to give it that impetus which it now sadly lacks. These would be the only lines on which any body of serious men assembled in Nationalist Convention could in my judgment be induced to apply their minds. That is my view of the purport and object of a National Convention.

MICHAEL DAVITT.

He says There is an Intense Desire for Unity in Australian Colonies.

A representative of the Freeman's Journal waited upon Mr. Davitt, M.P., at his home at Ballybrack on January 12, and we make the following extract from the interview:

Reporter:—What is the feeling in the Colonies on the divisions in the Parliamentary ranks?
Mr. Davitt:—Two words will fully answer your question—discouragement and disgust. Let me relate two incidents which occurred in my tour, to illustrate the depth of angry feeling on the matter among our friends. I was visiting Mackay in Queensland, one day with the object of studying the Kanaka labour question. Driving along with some friends we observed an old man hailing us from a cane field. We halted until he came alongside a bright kine and spoke to him in the Hawaiian language for forty years. In the name of God, sir, said the old fellow, addressing me right off, "I have you no thought for the Irish abroad in your mind at home! If you cannot stop your shameful wranglings and dissonances on political grounds, I feel that it will be the shame and humiliation which it all inflicts upon the majority of the Irish race in the world outside of Ireland." The other incident happened while I was staying a brief time at Honolulu, in the main street of that lovely city I was stopped by a man who I thought he knew me. He had attended a meeting which I addressed in Drogheda in 1881, which Clifford Lloyd had attended to support. He spoke to me once about the split at home and repeated, in other words, the prayer of the old Queensland, adding, "Surely, sir, all common sense has not left Ireland yet, and if there is any sense remaining in the minds of those who appear to have lost all true National feeling, there must be union soon, with Lord Salisbury and Mr. Chamberlain in power." These incidents fully reflect all that is said and thought by our friends throughout the seven Australian Colonies, and on my way home through America. And, I can add this comment upon that state of feeling: I am convinced that unless there is union now, when every thing seems to work by way of increasing the disunion of our political enemies and our own race, no future Constitutional movement in Ireland will obtain sanction or support from the Irish race abroad.

Reporter:—This is a very strong statement, Mr. Davitt, and I feel sure that it will have much weight with all the friends of Home rule at this juncture. Was Cardinal Moran's message to Ireland not framed in a similar spirit?
Mr. Davitt:—I will say that such an appeal, though so eloquently spoken as at my last meeting in Sydney. Had the most rabid partisan of any section of Irish Nationalists, with a remnant of patriotic feeling in his heart, heard this great dignitary of the Church and State touching and that message of peace and good will, he would never again lend voice or act on the side of disunion. The Parallels of Sydney are a small body, but they are sterling Nationalists, and they were as eager

for union after Cardinal Moran's speech as any among those who think that the majority were right at the origin of all the trouble. There are no parties or sections now among the Irish in Australia. Their position is this—We are all ready to give the movement at home instant help and constant support when there is union in Ireland and an end put to suicidal disunion. But until that work is accomplished there will be no assistance lent to faction fighting from this part of the world.

MR. REDMOND.

He Repudiates Reconciliation With the Nationalists.

Mr. J. E. Redmond, M.P., speaking at a meeting in Elphin on the 18th in the course of his speech said: You have been hearing a good deal lately upon the question of restoring unity amongst the Nationalists of Ireland. Well, I have only to repeat to-day what I have said all along upon the subject. Ireland, in my opinion, can never again achieve anything really valuable or herself until she has restored unity in the ranks of Irish Nationalists (cheers). But I say further that in my opinion the only way in which that unity can be restored is the way that Rosecombon at the last election restored unity amongst her Parliamentary representatives (cheers). Let there be no mistake in the mind of any man. We believe that there never can be union in Ireland around men who have proved themselves in capable of loyalty to a friend, a colleague, a leader, or a principle. There never, furthermore, can be union in Ireland around a policy of subservience to an English Party, and I say on this question of unity let Ireland follow the example of Rosecombon (cheers). Let Ireland rally round the men who have proved themselves loyal alike to their friends and their principles; let Ireland rally round the men who have proved themselves loyal to the principle of an independent Ireland and an independent Irish representation (cheers). I regret extremely that my friend and your honoured representative Mr. O'Kelly (cheers) is not here with us to-day, but I will give you a sufficient reason—he is the representative in London at this moment of the "Irish Daily Independent" (cheers for that Independent), and we felt that at a moment such as this when such enormous questions are looming upon the political horizon all around the world, it would not be safe for us to take away from his place even for one day our representative at the headquarters of the British Empire. Fellow-countrymen, on this question of unity I have one word more to say. Yesterday evening, travelling down to Rosecombon, I read in the train a letter, written to an Irish friend, whose name is not given by Mr. Gladstone (groans) with reference to Irish union, and Mr. Gladstone in that letter stated that in his opinion Ireland could not hope to get much from England until what he called the deplorable dissonances amongst her Parliamentary representatives were brought to an end (hear, hear). Now, just think for one moment. Disunion—what created disunion in Ireland? Gladstone did. Who destroyed Parnell's power and influence (a voice—Gladstone). Why, in Committee Room 16 I was one of a deputation of four who went on the part of the Irish Party to Mr. Gladstone to ask him to give us certain assurances with regard to the Home Rule bill that he was going to introduce because Mr. Parnell had declared that if Mr. Gladstone gave those assurances then for a short period at any rate he would step aside, and enable the crisis to be averted. We went to Gladstone and begged him with tears in our eyes to avert the horrible danger that threatened Ireland, and we said—"If you mean honestly by Ireland, in God's name give us these assurances and the crisis will be averted." He refused to do so, he refused to say the word which would have eased the political situation; he broke the unity of the Irish race throughout the world; he divided the people at home in hostile camps; he destroyed the greatest leader that Ireland has had this century, and then when his Home Rule Bill had been rejected he deserted the cause of Home Rule. He retired from his office instead of fulfilling his duty, which, in my opinion, was to have died in harness on behalf of the cause in whose name he was able to divide Ireland and destroy our leader. And that is the man who from his retirement to-day has the audacity to taunt the Irish people with the disunion that he created himself. Our answer to this cry of his is a perfectly plain one. We say we believe in unity. We say we are working for unity. We say we promise that there will be unity soon, but it will be the unity of men who have wakened from the hideous dream

of the past four or five years. It will be the unity of men who have been opened to the truth, it will be the unity of men who resent the action of Mr. Gladstone towards our country, and who are determined to put the English Liberal Party in their proper place (cheers).

ARCHBISHOP O'BRIEN'S LECTURE.

Before the Athenaeum Society of Acadia College.—"A Night with Pharaoh."

Wolfville, N.S., January 18.—The lecture of Archbishop O'Brien before the Athenaeum Society was highly appreciated by the citizens of Wolfville. His Grace's subject, "A Night with Pharaoh," was treated in a comprehensive and scholarly style. He started with the early history of Egypt, setting first the chronology of the dynasties. The first really authentic date of Egyptian history he put at 1850 B.C. From this time back to the time of Moses, the first king of whom there is record, the pyramids affirm the existence of 75 kings. Putting the average length of reign at 22 years, we have a period of 1650 years, adding 200 years for the reign of usurpers, this would place the reign of the first Egyptian king at 3200 B.C. This Moses his Grace would claim to be identical with the grandson of Noah, who is mentioned in the Bible as reigning in the country. These early kings were but the chiefs of tribes who had evidently come from the east and ascended the Nile, as observations of the monuments show. The country at an early date was divided into small districts for the purpose of government. Education was fostered, and the child of low degree, by industry and ability, could rise to a position of prominence. A kind of feudal system existed. Many kinds of industry were engaged in, and civilization generally well advanced. The court of a Pharaoh was almost as fully equipped as that of any modern monarch. The science of medicine and anatomy received considerable attention; mining was early engaged in, and as the pyramids affirm the art of quarrying stone had reached a high degree of perfection. They were a warlike people, having many conflicts with the very tribes who engaged in hostilities with the English a few years ago. The religion of their recorded periods seems to have been vastly idolatrous, but traces remain of an earlier faith essentially Christian. They believed in the immortality of the soul. And in Oasis, their eternal God, they have the fulfilment of a prophecy handed down from Adam concerning the incarnation of Christ. This fact his Grace considered a heavy argument in favor of the orthodox belief in creation and an early revelation to man.

He then followed the history of the Israelites as illumined by the pictures and inscriptions of the pyramids. There is still in existence a picture of an Egyptian king before whom are standing a band of people strongly Semitic in features. From comparison of records it has been concluded that this is a picture of Abraham at the time of his descent into Egypt, thus confirming the Bible account of this event. Other pictures and inscriptions were described which could only be interpreted as in harmony with the Bible account of Joseph and the oppression of the Israelites, although their name does not appear in these ancient inscriptions. His Grace rather startled his audience by announcing that the children of Israel did not cross the Red Sea, and more: that the Bible did not affirm such a thing. This is but a misconception of our early teachers which is being cleared away by modern research. He then, by means of a map, followed the course of Israel along a very much more northern route than that generally accepted, bringing them near the Mediterranean sea, which is the sea spoken of in the Bible. Here they found the low lying land overflowed, but by the power of the Lord the waters rolled away, affording the Israelites a passage, but cruelly returning to overwhelm the following Egyptians. He then pointed out their course through the desert toward the south to Sinai, where first they got their view of the Red sea.

This interesting and instructive lecture lasted for over an hour, and although His Grace adhered most closely to his paper it was listened to throughout with eager attention.

Very Rev. Dr. O'Gorman.

Press cablegrams from Rome announce the appointment of Very Rev. Thomas O'Gorman, D. D., of the Catholic University, to the bishopric of Sioux Falls.

ARMENIAN HORRORS.

Official Report of the Sassoun Outrages.

One Chapter of Diabolical History—This is What England Has Permitted—Another Letter From Mr. Gladstone—God Alone Can Help the Armenians.

London, Jan. 25.—The Chronicle will to-morrow say that two blue books on the Armenian massacres have been issued by the Government. The first contains the despatches between the Consuls and diplomats, while the second gives the process verbal of the Armenian commission. The blue books deal only with the Sassoun outrages and do not mention the later reports. The Consuls confirm the newspaper stories so far as the nature of the outrages goes, telling of brutal tortures, burning alive, the violation of women, the tossing of children on bayonets, etc., by Kurds and soldiers. Long extracts are given from the report of the Consular delegates on the commission to Sir Philip Currie, the British Ambassador to Turkey. This report states that the fact that the Kurds accompanied the troops and that no steps were taken to compel them to withdraw may be regarded as proved. It must also be regarded as having been established that the Kurds and soldiers were the joint authors of the burning of entire villages. Moreover, it was not proved that the Armenians were in revolt. The victims at Ghelguzan are estimated to have been about 40. The report does not support the newspaper stories which stated that the victims numbered thousands, but it protests against the difficulty thrown in the way of the enquiry and the duplicity of the Turkish commissioners and officials. The second blue book contains an important memorandum by Consul Shipley upon the report of the delegates. This declares that the Consul is compelled to regard the stories told by newspapers and similar sources told elsewhere as being enormously exaggerated and in certain instances absolutely invented for the purposes of adding to the horrors. Nevertheless Consul Shipley says it is impossible to doubt that in certain ravines of the Antok mountains fugitives were attacked by soldiers and Kurds and massacred with savage brutality regardless of age or sex. Consul Shipley remarks that an agitation subsisting of Government authority has proceeded for years among the Armenians in the Moosh and Talori regions. This agitation was instigated by the Armenian Committee abroad. It was the failure to successfully cope with the agitation that finally exasperated the Turkish officials. On the other hand, the Government entirely failed to protect the Armenians from the constant extortions of the Kurds and rapacity of the officials. The Armenians were obliged to pay tribute to the Kurds to prevent their houses from being burned and their cattle stolen, the Government never attempting to prevent such outrages. It was impossible to expect the Armenians to be contented under such conditions. Mr. Shipley concludes that it was not so much the suppression of a pseudo revolt that was desired by the Turkish officials as the extermination of the Armenians in the Ghelguzan and Talori districts. He estimated at 900 the number of victims in Sassoun.

Mr. Gladstone has written another letter on the Armenian question, in which, after referring to the murderous wickedness of the Sultan, his absolute victory over the powers and their unparalleled disgrace and defeat, he says:—I cannot wholly abandon the hope that out of this darkness light will arise, but the matter rests with the Almighty, to whom surely all should address fervent prayers in behalf of His suffering creatures.

WAR ON THE CHURCH.

The French Government undertakes its Plan of Campaign against the Church.

New York, January 25.—A World special cable from Paris, says: The report that the present Radical Government has decided to recall M. De Béhaine, the French Ambassador to the Vatican, because of his too great friendliness towards the Pope, may be true, or may not. But it seems certain, in any event, that Premier Bourgeois means to make good his declaration, soon after taking office, that he contemplates drastic measures against the Catholic Church in France. M. Bourgeois' first official statement in the Chamber of Deputies contained a promise "of a bill to regulate association, a prelude to the separation of Church and State." This bill will be introduced shortly.

A DENIAL FROM ROME.

Pope Leo did not offer to Arbitrate the Venezuelan Dispute.

Rome, Jan. 21.—The Osservatore Romano to-day says there is not a shadow of truth in the statement that the Pope, through Cardinal Stollhi, has offered President Cleveland to arbitrate the Venezuelan dispute, or that he has also instructed Cardinal Vaughan to ascertain the feeling of the British Government regarding his proposition.

Continuing, the Osservatore Romano denies that His Holiness offered his services as mediator at the beginning of the Venezuelan dispute, and that the Marquis of Salisbury refused them.

MUCH SYMPATHY.

Expressed for the Queen and Princess Beatrice in their affliction.

London, January 25.—Queen Victoria will, in May, be entering her 78th year, infirm in bodily health, unutterably sad in mind, bereft almost wholly of friends and servants, and living in gloomy reverie on the past, memories of her dead. This thought of the aged sovereign, so pitiful in her increasing isolation, comes uppermost now in Englishmen's minds whenever royalty is mentioned, and it rises swiftly, overpoweringly everywhere, when the news of the death of Prince Henry of Battenberg was spread on Wednesday. People of all grades and conditions recalled in a flash how it would affect the Queen, and this reflection colored intuitively all their thoughts and words. In truth, the event involves a deeper personal affliction for the Queen than, perhaps, any other death in the actual family since she was widowed. Not even her own son son, Leopold, who died eleven years ago, was so close to her or so much a part of her daily domestic life as was Prince Henry. He had a remarkable aptitude for the role that he was called on to play, and he waited on her, watched over her, smoothed the routine of existence for her, with untiring zeal.

GREAT CARDINAL'S DEATH.

Guillaume Rene Meignan, Archbishop of Tours, Distinguished Writer.

Paris, January 20.—Cardinal Guillaume Rene Meignan, Archbishop of Tours, was found dead in bed at his palace at Tours on January 20.

Guillaume Rene Meignan was the first prelate in France who accepted with enthusiasm Cardinal Lavigne's announcement that the Vatican was reconciled with the republican form of government in France. A Provençal, born at Denaze, in Mayenne, April 11, 1817, he studied at Angers and at Chateau Gonther, was ordained a priest in 1843 and attained celebrity in three years of professorship in the small college of Tesse, founded by Mgr. Bouvier.

He became director of studies at the Seminary of Notre-Dame-des-Champs, almoner at the Legion of Honor House of Saint Denis, vicar of the parishes of St. Joseph and St. Andrew, vicar of Sainte Clothilde parish, where he remained from 1857 to 1862. He was appointed professor of holy writ at the Sorbonne and Vicar-General of Paris in 1863, Bishop of Chalons in 1864, Bishop of Arras in 1882 and Archbishop of Tours in 1882.

He was Honorary Canon of the dioceses of Algiers, Arras, Paris and Rheims, and an officer of the Legion of Honor. He wrote in 1892: "The clergy, in principle and in duty bound, makes war against no form of government. The clergy is not and cannot be an enemy of the progress that nations are so justly anxious to achieve. War against the clergy is without cause and without advantage. In his encyclical letter Leo XIII., the apostle of pacification in the nineteenth century, has given an irrefutable testimony to this statement by simply telling what Christian teachings are. Leo XIII., when everything apparently condemned him to powerlessness and to inactivity, has been faithful to the traditional mission of Sovereign Pontiff. The principal acts of his reign might be written in two chapters, the titles of which should be "The Maintenance of Peace," "The Reestablishment of Peace in the Church and in the States."

Mgr. Meignan was created a Cardinal in 1893. He published in 1868 "Les Prophetes Messianiques"; in 1878, "Les Deux Premiers Livres des Rois"; in 1889, "David, Roi, Psalmiste, Prophete"; in 1863, "M. Rensan Refute par les Rationalistes Allomands"; in 1864, "Les Evangelistes et la Critique au XIXe Siecle"; in 1869, "La Monde et l'Homme Primitif Selon Le Bible"; in 1880, "Leon XIII., Pacificateur"; in 1892, "L'Onirisme et l'Antique Testament, Quatre Siecles de Lutte Contre l'Idolatrie."