



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

VOL. XXIII.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, DEC. 13, 1872.

NO. 18

BOOKS FOR DECEMBER.

Sadler's New Uniform and Complete Edition of—	
LOVER'S WORKS, Comprising Rory O'Moore, Handy Andy, Treasure Trove, Legends and Stories of Ireland; Poetical Works, 5 vols. in Box. Per vol.	1 00
THE LIFE OF FATHER MATHEW, the People's Soggarth Aroon. By Sister Mary Frances Clare, Author of Life of St. Patrick, etc.	75
THE HEART OF MYRRHA LAKE; or, Into the Light of Christianity. By Minnie Mary Lee.	1 00
THE LIFE AND TIMES OF POPE SIXTUS THE FIFTH. By Baron Hubner, Late Ambassador of Austria at Paris and at Rome. Translated from the original French by James F. Molino.	1 00
FLEURANGE. By Madame Augustus Craven. Author of "A Sister's Story," etc.	1 50
ALL-HALLOW'S EVE; or, The Test of Futurity, and other Stories.	2 00
THE HISTORY OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY. Translated from the French of Orsini, by Very Rev. F. C. Husenbeth.	2 00
THE ILLUSTRATED CATHOLIC FAMILY ALMANAC for 1873.	25
THE CATHOLIC WORLD. Contents:—The Spirit of Protestantism; Fleurance; Sayings of John Climacus; Dante's Purgatorio; Sanscrit and the Vedas; The House that Jack Built; St. Peter's Roman Pontificate; Sayings; The Progressionists; Christian Art of the Catacombs; Beating the Air; A Retrospect; The Russian Clergy; The Cross Through Love and Love Through the Cross; Odd Stories; Signs of the Times; New Publications, etc. Terms, per annum.	4 50
Single Copies	45
Sent free by Mail on receipt of price.	
D. & J. SADLER & CO., Montreal.	

of mutual slaughter. (Applause.) They were at the opening of a far more terrific period. We must discuss these questions, my friends, calmly and historically. We must look upon them rather like the antiquarian prying into the past, than with the living, warm feelings of men whose blood boils up with the remembrance of so much injustice and so much bloodshed. (Applause.) In order to understand this question fully and fairly, it is necessary for us to go back to the historical events of the times. I find, then, that James I., the man who "planted" Ulster, that is to say, who confiscated, utterly and entirely, six of the fairest counties in Ireland—an entire province, rooting out the aboriginal Irish Catholic inhabitants, even to a man, and giving the whole country to Scotch and English settlers of the Protestant religion, under the condition that they were not to have even as much as an Irish laborer on their grounds, but that they were to banish them away. But this man died in 1625, and was succeeded by his unfortunate son, Charles I. When Charles came to the throne, bred up as he was in the traditions of a monarchy which Henry VIII. had rendered most absolute, as we know, whose absolute power was still continued under Elizabeth under forms the most tyrannical, whose absolute power was continued by his own father, James I.—Charles came to the throne with the most exaggerated ideas of royal privileges and royal supremacy. But during the days of his father a new spirit had grown up in England and in Scotland. The form which Protestantism took in Scotland was the hard, uncompromising, and I will add, cruel form of Calvinism in its most repellent aspect. The men who rose in Scotland in defence of their Presbyterian religion, rose, not against Catholics at all, but against the Episcopal-Protestants of England. They defended what they called their Kirk, or covenant; they fought bravely, I acknowledge, for it, and they ended by establishing it as the religion of Scotland. Now, Charles I. was an Episcopal-Protestant of the most sincere and devoted kind. The Parliament of England in the very first years of Charles, admitted members who were very strongly tinged with Scotch Calvinism, and they at once showed a refractory spirit to their king. He demanded of them certain subsidies, and they refused him; he asserted certain sovereign rights, and they denied them. But whilst all this was going on in England, from the year 1630 to the year, let us say 1641, what was taking place in Ireland? One province of the land had been completely confiscated by James I. Charles was in want of money for his own purposes, and his Parliament refused to grant him any; and the poor, oppressed, down-trodden Catholics of Ireland imagined, naturally enough, that the king being in difficulties he would turn to them and perhaps lend them a little countenance, a little favor, if they proclaimed their loyalty and stood by him. Accordingly, the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, Lord Falkland, sincerely attached as he was to his royal master—he hinted to the Catholics, and proposed to them that, as they were under the most terrific penal laws from the days of Elizabeth and of James I., that perhaps if they should now petition the king, they might get certain graces or concessions granted to them. What were these graces? They simply involved permission to live in their own land, and permission to worship their God according to the dictates of their own consciences. (Applause.) They asked for nothing more—nothing more was promised to them. When their petition went before the king, his royal majesty of England issued a proclamation in which he declared that it was his intention and that he had pledged his word to grant to the Catholics and to the people of Ireland certain concessions or indulgencies which he named by the name of "graces." No sooner does the newly-founded Puritan element in England, and the Parliament that was fighting rebelliously against their king—no sooner did they hear that the slightest relaxation of the penal law was to be granted to the Catholics of Ireland, than they instantly rose and protested that it should not be. Charles, to his eternal disgrace, broke his word with the Catholics of Ireland after they had sent him £120,000 in acknowledgment of his bounty. (Hisses.) More than this. It was suspected that Lord Falkland was too mild a man, too just a man to be allowed to remain as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and he was recalled, and after a short relapse, Wentworth, who was afterwards Earl of Strafford, was sent to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant. Wentworth, on his arrival, summoned a parliament and they met in the year 1634. He told them the difficulties the king was in; he told them his parliament in England was rebelling against him, and how he looked to his Irish subjects as loyal, and perhaps he told them that amongst Catholics loyalty is not a mere sentiment, but it is an unshaken principle resting on conscience and assured through the church. (Applause.) And

then he assured them that Charles, the King of England, still intended to keep his word, and to grant them their concessions or their graces. Next came the usual demand for money, and the Irish Parliament granted six subsidies of £50,000 each. Strafford wrote to the King of England congratulating him on having got so much money out of the Irish. "For," says he, "your Majesty, you know that we only expected subsidies of £30,000, and they have granted subsidies of £50,000." More than this, they granted him 3,000 infantry and 1,000 horses to fight against his rebellious Scottish subjects and enemies. The Parliament met the following year, in 1635, and what do you think was the fulfilment of the royal promise to the Catholics of Ireland? Strafford had got the money. He did not wish to compromise his master, the king, so he took it upon himself and fixed upon his memory the indelible shame and disgrace of breaking the word which he had pledged, and disappointing the Catholics of Ireland. Then, in 1635, the following year, the real character of this man came out, and what do you think was the measure he proposed? He instituted a commission with the express purpose of confiscating, in addition to Ulster that was already gone, the whole province of Connaught, so as not to leave an Irishman or a Catholic one single inch of ground in that land. This he called "The Commission of Defective Titles." They were commissioned to inquire into the title every man had to his property, and to inquire into it with the express and avowed purpose of finding a flaw in it, so that they could confiscate it to the Crown of England. Now remember how much was gone already, my friends; the whole of Ulster was confiscated by James I. The same king had taken Longford from the O'Farrells, who owned it from time immemorial, had seized upon Wicklow and taken it from the O'Toole's and O'Brynes, had taken the northern part of the County Wexford from the O'Connell's, and Kings County from the O'Malloys. Now with the whole of Ulster and the better part of Leinster in his hands, this monster comes in and institutes a commission by which he was to obtain the whole of the Province of Connaught, root out the native Irish population, expel every man who owned a rood of land in the province, and reduce them to beggary, starvation and death. Here is a description of his plan as given by Leland, a historian who is hostile to Ireland's faith and to Ireland's nationality. Leland thus describes the business: "His project," he says, "was nothing less than to subvert the title of every estate in every part of Connaught; a project which, when first proposed in the late reign, was received with horror and amazement, but which suited the undimmed and enterprising genius of Lord Wentworth." Accordingly, he began in the County of Roscommon, he passed from Roscommon to Sligo, then to Mayo and then to Galway. The only way in which a title could be upset was by having a jury of twelve men to agree to their verdict as to whether the title was valid or not. Strafford began by picking his jury and packing them. The old story over again. The old policy which has been followed down to our own time, the policy of packing a perjured jury. (Applause.) He succeeded. He told the jury before the trials began that he expected them to find a verdict for the king, and between bribing and threatening them he got juries that found for him until he came into my own county of Galway. (Applause.) For the honor of old Galway be it said that as soon as this commission arrived in that county they could not find twelve jurors in the County of Galway to pass a verdict to confiscate the property of their fellow-citizens. (Great applause.) What was the result? The result was that the County Galway jurors were called to Dublin before the Council Chamber; every man of them was fined £1,000 and was put into prison until the fine was paid. Every inch of their property was taken from them, and the High Sheriff of the County Galway, not being a wealthy man, being fined £4,000 died in jail because he was not able to pay his fine. (Hisses.) More than this. Not content with threatening the jury and coercing them, my Lord Strafford sent to the judges and told them they were to get four shillings in the pound for the value of every single property confiscated to the Crown of England, and then he boasted publicly of it and said: "I have made the Chief Baron and the other justices attend to this business as if it were their own private concern." This is the way Ireland was ruled, and this is the kind of rule that the learned English historian comes to America to ask the honest and the upright citizens of this free country to endorse by their verdict—(laughter)—and thereby to make themselves accomplices in England's robbery. (Applause.) In the same year this Strafford instituted another tribunal in Ireland which he called "The Court of Wards." Do you know what this was? It was found that the Irish people, gentle and simple, were very unwilling

to become Prote-tants. I have not a harsh word to say of the Protestants, but this I will say, that every high-minded Protestant in the world must admire the strength and the fidelity with which Irishmen, because of their conscience, cling to their ancient faith and forms of belief. (Applause.) This tribunal was instituted in order to take the heirs of Catholic gentlemen and bring them up in the Protestant religion, and it was to this Court of Wards that we owe the significant fact that some of the most ancient and the best names of Ireland—the names of men whose ancestors fought for faith and fatherland—are now Protestants and the enemies of their Catholic fellow-subjects. It was by this, by such means as this, that the men of my own name became Protestant. There was not a drop of Protestant blood in the veins of the Dun Earl or Red Earl of Clanciarde. There was not a drop of other than Catholic blood in the veins of the heroic Burkes that fought during the long five hundred years that went before this time. (Applause.) There was no Protestant blood in the O'Brien's of Munster, nor in the glorious O'Donnells and O'Neill's of Ulster. Let no Protestant American citizen here imagine that I am speaking in disdain of him or of his religion. No! But as a historian I am pointing out the means—which every high-minded man must pronounce to be nefarious—by which the aristocracy of Ireland were obliged to change their religion. (Applause.) The Irish meantime waited, and waited in vain, for the fulfilment of the king's promise of a concession, or a grace as they were called. At length matters grew desperate between Charles and the Parliament, and in the year 1640 Charles again renewed his promise to the Irish people and their parliament, which gave him four subsidies, 8,000 men and 1,000 horses, to fight against the Scots who had rebelled against him. Earl Strafford went home, rejoicing that he had got these subsidies and this body of men; but no sooner did he arrive in England than the Parliament, now in rebellion, laid hold of him, and in that same year, 1640, Strafford's head was cut off, and it would be a strange Irishman that would regret it. (Laughter.) Meantime the people of Scotland rose in armed rebellion against their king. They marched into England and what do you think they made by their movement? They got the full enjoyment of their religion, which was not Protestant, but Presbyterian; they got £300,000, and they got for several months £550 a day to support their army. Then they retired into their own country, having achieved the purpose for which they had rebelled. In the meantime the Catholics in Ireland were ground into the very dust. What wonder, I ask you, that, seeing that the King was afraid of his English people—although personally inclined to grant these graces—he had declared that he had wished to grant them the Irish had every evidence that if the king were free he would grant them. But he was not free, because the Parliament and the Puritan faction in England were in rebellion. And so the Irish said, and naturally: "Our king is not free; if he were he would be just. Let us arise in the name of government and assert our own rights." (Applause.) They arose like one man. Every Irishman, every Catholic in Ireland, arose on the 23rd of October, 1641, with the exception of the Catholic lords of the Pale. And now I give you the reasons for this rising, as recorded in the memoirs of Lord Castlehaven, who was by no means prejudiced in favor of the Irishmen. He tells us: "They rose for six reasons: "First, because they were generally looked down upon as a conquered nation, seldom or never trusted like natural or free-born subjects." The old feeling still coming up, dear friends. The very first reason given by this Englishman why the Irish people rose, was that the English people treated them contemptuously. Oh, when will England learn to respect her subjects or her friends with common respect?—when will proud Anglo-Saxon haughtiness condescend to urbanity and kindness in the treatment of those around them? I said it in my first lecture. I said it in my second lecture, and I prove it in this: that it was the contempt as much as the hatred of the Englishman for the Irishman that lay at the root, and lies at the root to-day, of that bitter spirit and antagonism that exist between these two nations. (Applause.) The second reason given by my Lord Castlehaven is that "since the Irish saw, that six whole counties in Ulster were escheated to the Crown, and little or nothing was bestowed on the natives, but the greater part bestowed by King James on his own countrymen, the Scotch." The third reason is, that in Strafford's time the crown laid claim to the counties of Roscommon, Mayo, Galway and Cork, and some parts of Tipperary, Limerick, Wicklow and others. The fourth reason was that "great severities were used against Roman Catholics, which, to a people so fond of their religion as the Irish are, was no small inducement to make them, whilst there was an opportunity, stand upon their guard."

The fifth reason was that "they see how the Scots, by pretending grievances and taking up arms to get them redressed, had not only gained divers privileges and immunities, but got £300,000 for their visit to England besides £350 a day for several months together. And the last reason was that they saw a storm brewing as the misunderstanding rose between the king and the Parliament. They believed that the king would grant them anything they in reason could demand; at least more now than they could otherwise expect." Now, I ask you, were not these reasons sufficient, I appeal to the people of America, I appeal to men who know what civil and religious liberty means for a high-spirited people whose spirit was never broken, never yielded—(tremendous applause)—for a people not inferior to the Anglo-Saxon either in gifts of intellect or in bodily energy; if a people thus forsaken, down-trodden as our fathers were, would not one, any one, of those reasons be sufficient justification to rise? And had they not an accumulation of all those causes which would have made them the meanest of mankind if they had not seized upon that opportunity. An English Protestant writer of the time, that very year '41, writing in *Havell's Hibernicus*, says, "That they had sundry grievances and grounds of complaint, both touching their estates and their consciences, which they pretended to be far greater than those of the Scotch; that they felt for them," he says. If the Scotch were suffered to introduce a new religion, that was not a reason why they should be punished in the exercise of their own, which they gloried in never to have altered. (Applause.) There was another reason for the revolt, my friends and a very competent one, and it was this; Charles had the weakness and the folly, I can call it nothing else, to leave at the head of the Irish cause two Lord Justices named Sir John Borlase and Sir William Parsons. These were both ardent Partisans and partisans of the Parliament; they were anxious to see the fall of the English monarch; they were his bitter enemies, and they thought he would be embarrassed in his fight with the Parliament in England by a revolution in Ireland, so the very men who were the guardians of the State lent themselves to promote the revolution by every means in their power. For instance, six months before this revolution broke out, Charles gave them notice that he had received intelligence that the Irish were going to rise; they took no notice whatever of the king's advertisement; the Lords of the Pale, who refused to join the Irish people in their uprising, appealed to the Justices in Dublin for protection, and it was refused them; they asked to be allowed in the city, that they might be saved from the incursions of the Irish, and that permission was refused them; they were forced to stay in their castles and in their houses, and the moment that any of the Irish in rebellion came near, their houses and castles were declared forfeited to the State. And so the English Catholic Lords of the Pale—the Lords of Gormanstown, Hooges, Trimbleton, and so many others, were actually forced by the Government to join hands with the Irish, and to draw their swords in the glorious cause. (Applause.) Moreover, the Irish knew that their friends and fellow-countrymen were earning distinction and honor and glory upon all the battle-fields of Europe, in the service of Spain, France and Austria, and they hoped in that rising that these their countrymen would help them in the hour of their need. Accordingly, on the 23rd of October, 1641, they rose. What was the first thing they did? According to Mr. Froude, the first thing they did was to massacre all the Protestants they could lay their hands on. Well, thank God! this is not the fact. (Great applause.) The very first thing that their leader, Sir Phelim O'Neill, did was to issue a proclamation through all Ireland, in which he declared: "We rise, in the name of our Lord and king—we rise to assert the power and prerogative of the king; we declare that we do not wish to make war upon the king or one of his subjects; we declare, moreover, that we do not intend to shed blood except in legitimate warfare; and if any one of our troops—any soldier—either robs, plunders, or sheds blood, he shall be severely punished." (Applause.) Did they keep this declaration of theirs? Most inviolably. I assert, in the name of history, that they did not massacre the Protestants, and I will prove it from Protestant authority. (Renewed applause.) We find despatches from the Irish Government to the Government in England, of the 27th of that same month, in which they gave them the account of the rising of the Irish people; there they complained, telling how the Irish stripped their Protestant fellow-citizens, took their cattle, took their houses, and took their property—but not one single word of complaint about one drop of bloodshed! (Applause.) And if they took their cattle and houses and property, you must remember that they only took back what was their own. (Re-

FATHER BURKE'S LECTURE
ON
"Ireland under Cromwell."
—
MR. FROUDE'S "GARDEN."
—
THE THIRD LECTURE IN ANSWER TO MR. FROUDE.
—
THE THEORIES OF MR. FROUDE CONTRADICTED, &c., &c.
—
(From the N. Y. Metropolitan Record.)

The academy of Music was crowded last Tuesday evening, Nov. 19th, in every part, the aisles and stage were jammed, by an attentive and enthusiastic audience to listen to the third lecture of the Very Reverend Father Burke, O. P., in reply to the same lecture of Mr. Froude. The boxes and dress circle were largely occupied by ladies, and the demonstrations of applause at the patriotic sentiments of the orator of the evening were of a very enthusiastic character. Among the audience we observed the Most Rev. Archbishop McCloskey, Right Rev. Bishop Lynch of Charleston, and Right Rev. Bishop Quinlan, of Mobile. The lecture was two and a half hours in length, but was listened to throughout with an earnest and devoted attention, not a soul leaving to the end of the discourse; and when reference was made to the necessary prolongation of the lecture by the speaker, he was interrupted eagerly by the enraptured audience and desired to proceed. He spoke as follows:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: We now approach, in answering Mr. Froude, to some of the most awful periods of our history; and I confess that I approach this terrific ground with sadness, and that I extremely regret that Mr. Froude should have opened up questions which oblige any Irishman to undergo the pain of heart and the anguish of spirit which the revision of this portion of our history must occasion. (Applause.) The learned gentleman began his third lecture by reminding his audience that he had closed his second with a reference to the rise, the progress, and the collapse of the great rebellion which took place in Ireland in the year 1641, that is to say, somewhat more than two hundred years ago. He made but a passing allusion to that great event in our history, and that allusion, if he be reported correctly, stated simply that the Irish rebelled in 1641. This is the first statement—that it was a rebellion; secondly, that this rebellion "began in massacre and ended in ruin;" thirdly, that for nine years the Irish leaders had the destinies of their country in their own hands; and, fourthly, that these nine years were years of anarchy and slaughter. Nothing, therefore, can be more melancholy than the picture drawn by this learned gentleman of these nine years; and yet I will venture to say, and I hope I shall be able to prove, that each of these four statements is without sufficient historical foundation. (Applause.) My first position is that the movement of 1641 was not a rebellion; secondly, that it did not begin in massacre, although it ended in ruin; thirdly, that the Irish leaders had not the destinies of their country in their hands during these years; and, fourthly, whether they had or not, that these years were not a period of anarchy or